NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXV.

AUGUST, 1895.

THE MENACE OF ROMANISM.

BY W. J. H. TRAYNOR, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

So MANY phases of the Papal question have been presented to the American people within the past five years that it is little to be wondered at that the great majority of our citizens are bewildered, and the remainder anything but reassured by these kaleidoscopic apparent changes. We have had Cahenslyism, Ultramontanism and "Liberal Catholicism." While Cahenslyism would appear to be consistent with Ultramontanism, there is, at first glance, something utterly irreconcilable between "Liberal Catholicism" and the others. The difference, however, if there be a difference, is rather abstract than concrete; a difference of terms rather than of principles, of policy rather than of doctrine. All true members of the Papal church must accept its canons and the *ex-cathedra* utterances of its head. Each—Ultramontane, Cahenslyist, and "Liberal" alike—believes in apostolic succession, the divine vicarship of the popes, papal infallibility, and all the dogmas and canons, superior and inferior, laid down by the church. The difference between the first and second upon the one hand, and the "Liberal Catholic" upon the other, is that Ultramontanism adheres to the principles of paparchy simply, while "Liberalism" is content with obedience to the voice of the living pontiff, as it speaks from day to day. This may ap-

Copyright, 1895, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pear to be a distinction with but a scarcely perceptible difference; while, in fact, the difference is most important and will bear careful examination.

The Ultramontane believes in the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and desires to assert it without regard to circumstances. The "Liberal Catholic" denies the claim of temporal supremacy literally, but admits it generally, and is prepared to insist upon its acceptance only in such degree as the living Pope may prescribe from time to time. While the Ultramontane, then, is bound by the traditions and laws of the paparchy, the "Liberal Catholic" concentrates his entire allegiance on obedience to the reigning pontiff.

When Liberal Catholics contend, as many of them do, that the Pope does not assume temporal jurisdiction, they violate neither the principles of truth nor their allegiance as papists; but not even the most liberal papist will assert that the laws of the paparchy do not confer upon the pontiff the right to claim and enforce his claim of temporal jurisdiction, nor that the popes have not frequently done so. There exists not a papist (and when I use the term I use it with all respect to the members of the papal faith) who does not place the Church above the State, and, consequently, the priest above the temporal ruler. Even Archbishop John Ireland, regarded throughout the length and breadth of the land, as the "most liberal of Catholics" and "most loyal" of American citizens, in speaking at Boston on April 28 last, said: "Next to God is country, and next to religion is patriotism." In the same speech he said: "*Vox populi vox Dei*, it is said. The words are true when the nation or state moves within the orbit of the powers delegated to it by the Supreme Master." As the papal hierarchy claims to be the only interpreter of the utterances of the Supreme Master, it follows necessarily that the Pope is the legitimate definer of the limits of the orbit of the state.

The Jesuit Schrader, in his affirmative propositions upon the Syllabus, asserts: "The Church has the power to apply external coercion. She also has a temporal authority direct and indirect." The remark is appended: "Not souls alone are subject to her authority." It will thus be seen that Archbishop Ireland merely puts a new mask upon an old face, and repeats Schrader's proposition in softened tones.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brownson was less politic, but not one whit more emphatic, when in criticising Montor's *History of the Roman Pontiffs* in January, 1853, he wrote:

"It is certainly undeniable that the concessions of sovereigns and the consent of the people were obtained on the ground that the Popes held the power by divine right, and that those maxims on which Mr. Gosselin relies for the justification of the Popes and Councils in exercising it, were that the spiritual order, and, therefore, the Church as the representative of that order, is supreme, and temporal sovereigns are subjected to it, and to the Pope as its supreme visible chief. Popes and Councils in exercising authority over sovereigns, even in temporals, were, according to those maxims, only exercising the inherent rights of the church as the spiritual authority, and consequently sovereigns were bound to obey them, not by human law only, but also by the law of God. Such incontestably is the doctrine of the magnificent bulls of St. Gregory and Boniface, and of the maxims according to which it is attempted to justify the power exercised over sovereigns by Popes and Councils. Now these maxims either were true or they were false. If they were false, how will you justify an infallible church—expressly ordained of God to teach the truth in faith and morals, and to conduct individuals and nations in the way of holiness—in adopting and acting on them? If they were true, how can you deny that the power exercised is of divine origin or contend that it is derived from the consent of the people, or the concession of sovereigns? . . .

"How dare you suppose, in case of a collision between her and public opinion, that she, not public opinion, is in the wrong and must give way?"

Among the captious, there may be some objection offered to one or other of the authorities quoted as not being the *ex-cathedra* utterances of a pope. In anticipation of the objection I point out that no pope has yet objected to either or condemned their utterances, but on the contrary, two popes have endorsed both.

With the Syllabus itself before us and the bull *Unam Sanctam*, lesser authorities are superfluous, however, and are introduced only as corroborative evidence of the pretensions of the papacy, as in the past, to temporal as well as spiritual supremacy. And, in truth, if we concede the papal assertions regarding apostolic succession, the claim is most consistent. If Leo XIII. is one of a divinely appointed line of God's vicegerents, he is as much superior to ordinary men as he is inferior to God, and it follows logically that he is above all earthly authority, whether temporal or spiritual.

The "liberal" papist does not feel himself called upon to categorically affirm what the Pope has not yet thought proper to specifically assert in this country and what eminent prelates have only considered it expedient to present in veiled language.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But if, as the paparchy assumes, the pontiff is delegated with supreme temporal power from a divine source, the question naturally intrudes itself: Why is this power not openly asserted in the United States and why do Liberal Catholics find it necessary to cloak their utterances concerning it ?

A comparison of the American Constitution with the canon law and encyclicals of the paparchy answers the question. The two are utterly irreconcilable one with the other, unless the United States be regarded merely as a province of the papal church, *a position which they at present hold according to papal definition.* This position was made most emphatic in an apostolic letter sent by Leo XIII. to the Bishops and Archbishops of the papal church in America, dated January 6th, 1895, from which I quote the following extract:

"Precisely at the epoch when the American colonies, having, with Catholic aid, achieved liberty and independence, coalesced into a constitutional Republic, the ecclesiastical hierarchy was happily established among you, and at the very time when the popular suffrage placed the great Washington at the helm of the Republic the first Bishop was set by apostolic authority over the *American Church.*"

Yet, although the principles of our American democracy and those of the papacy are so utterly diverse, they are not so far apart but that popes and priests are forging a chain of circumstances with which to unite them together, and this, be it said, not through mutual concessions, as the apologists for the papacy would have us believe, but through generosity and ignorance upon the part of the American people, and apparent concessions which yield nothing but empty words upon the part of the Pope and his followers.

The policy of positive antagonism to the American public school system which was pursued for a number of years prior to the formation of the American Protective Association, has given place to the negative policy of letting it severely alone and extolling the merits of the parochial system. Not that the papacy hates the American public schools less nor seeks their destruction less ardently, but because the desired end can be more speedily attained through diplomacy than through force; and while the Pontiff reserves to himself the full powers conferred upon him by paparchical laws and decrees, he holds these powers in abeyance until it may become expedient to employ them, while

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meantime link by link the chain is forged that is intended to unite the State to the Church.

Pius IX. thundered anathemas and bulls at all liberty whatsoever. Leo XIII. and his lieutenants in the United States approach the same end wrapped in the mantle of American Liberty and speech softened by the oil of diplomacy. Pius IX. in an encyclical dated December 8, 1864, hurled the following utterance at the exponents of liberty :

"Actuated by an idea of social government so absolutely false, they do not hesitate further to propagate the erroneous opinion, very hurtful to the safety of the Catholic Church and souls, and termed 'delirium' by our predecessor Gregory XVI. of excellent memory, viz., that liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man, a right which ought to be proclaimed and established by law in every well constituted state; and that citizens are entitled to make known and declare, with a liberty which neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil authority can limit, their convictions of whatsoever kind, either by word of mouth, or through the press, or by other means. . . .

"Gregory XVI. in an encyclical in 1832 declared freedom of conscience 'one of the most pestilent of errors;' freedom of press, 'very disastrous, very detestable, and never to be sufficiently execrated, that mortal plague, never to be extirpated until the guilty elements of evil perish utterly in flames.'"

Pius IX. again, in an allocution dated March 18, 1861, condemns "modern civilization, whence come so many deplorable evils, so many detestable opinions; which even countenances faiths that are not Catholic and which does not repel unbelievers from public employments, and which opens the Catholic schools to their children."

Even Bossuet, a 'liberal' papist, asserted that "the prince ought to use his authority to destroy false religions in his realm. Those who wish the prince to show no rigor in the matter of religion, because religion ought to be free, are in impious error."

If Pius IX. or Gregory were to send such messages to the American people to-day they would only afford sport for the satirist, yet Leo XIII. makes substantially the same assertions clothed in gentler verbiage, and these are received either with silent or expressed approval by a large proportion of the press and people of the United States. In his encyclical of January 6, 1895, he says:

"Nevertheless, since the thirst for reading and knowledge is so vehement and widespread among you, and since, according to circumstances, it can be productive of good or evil, every effort should be made to increase the number of intelligent and well-disposed writers *who take religion* (papal)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for their guide and virtue for their constant companion. It is, of course, the function of the clergy (papal) to devote their care and energies to this great work; but the age and the country require that journalists should be equally zealous in the same cause, and labor in it to the full extent of their powers. Let them, however, seriously reflect that their writings, if not positively prejudicial to religion, will surely be of slight service to it unless in concord of minds they all seek the same end. They who desire to be of real service to the church, and with their pens heartily to defend the Catholic cause, should carry on the conflict with perfect unanimity and, as it were, with serried ranks, for they rather inflict than repel war if they waste their strength by discord. In this manner their work, instead of being profitable and fruitful, becomes injurious and disastrous *whenever they presume to call before their tribunal the decisions and acts of Bishops, and, casting off due reverence, cavil and find fault. The Bishops, placed in the lofty position of authority, are to be obeyed.* . . . Now, this reverence, which it is lawful to no one to neglect, should of necessity be eminently conspicuous and exemplary in Catholic journalists."

In another part of the same encyclical the Pope declares:

"Wherefore we ardently desire that this truth should sink day by day more deeply into the minds of Catholics, namely, that they can in no better way *safeguard their own individual interests and the common good than by yielding a heart submission and obedience to the Church.*"

Not one word of admonition regarding submission to the State is inserted until we come to the following:

"In like manner let the priests be persistent in keeping before the minds of the people the enactments of the Third Council of Baltimore, particularly those which inculcate . . . the observance of the *just* laws and institutions of the republic."

The adjective in italics is worthy the consideration of the reader, and gains more than passing significance in light of the papal admonition which commands papists to refuse to obey all laws that are not sanctioned by the papacy, and of Leo's encyclical to the papists in the United States commanding them to render obedience to Francisco Satolli, "*constitutions and apostolic ordinances notwithstanding.*"

Although the exhortation to unquestioning obedience practically constitutes the chain of papal imperialism in the United States, the links thereof are numerous and varied in character. There is the anti-mixed-marriage link; the anti-freedom-of-the-press link; the anti-public-school link; the anti-secret-society link; the labor link, and last, but by no means least, the political link. In all spheres of the papist's citizenship the Pope presumes to meddle and to dictate, although apologists for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papacy would have us believe that all there is of the papal hierarchy is religious.

Space being precious, I pass over the questions of mixed marriages, education, liberty of speech and press, and secret societies, and will confine myself to the political features of the papal propaganda, after a passing allusion to the labor question as laid down in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. The evident object of the encyclical is to unify the papist labor of the United States, in order that it may secure the same advantages in the labor market as in politics the papist vote until recently held in the City of New York and other large cities, and eventually, under the leadership of the priesthood, grasp the balance of power in the commercial and labor world. This hypothesis receives added strength in the light of the following excerpt from Encyclical *Longinqua* of January 6 last :

"Nay, rather, unless forced by necessity to do otherwise, Catholics ought to prefer to associate with Catholics, a course which would be very conducive to the safeguarding of their faith. As presidents of societies thus formed among themselves, it would be well to appoint either priests or upright laymen of weight and character, guided by whose councils they should endeavor peacefully to adopt and carry into effect such measures as may seem most advantageous to their interests, keeping in view the rules laid down by us in our encyclical *Rerum Novarum*."

The political sphere, many good, well-intentioned, but badly informed souls, and others who are neither so badly informed nor so well intentioned, would have us believe papal priests and prelates eschew, and the laity affect it only as citizens, unbiased by priestly exhortation or compulsion.

The papacy claims the right to govern the morals of her subjects, and affirms that "politics are morals on a larger scale." I am aware that both assertions have been denied by those whose interest it was to deny them, but in the light of history such denials are scarcely worth consideration. What the papacy has been in the past it is but reasonable to suppose it is at present and will be in the future, especially if its present conduct confirms the presumption.

Turning back the pages of European history for half a century, we find that in 1830 the parliament of Belgium—a country under a good king and the most liberal government—was hampered, and its freedom menaced by the clerical element, which, though in the minority, contrived to hold the balance of power,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to stir up disaffection among their supporters against the government. At the time of the Brabant revolution the governor of the Austrian Low Countries wrote to Leopold as follows:

. . . "The aristocracy, the priests, the monks, the populace, and the bulk of the nation, which is neither democratic nor aristocratic, but which is inflamed by the fanatical and insinuating teaching of the priests.

"Since the end of the last century Belgium has had two revolutions, but both times at the voice of the clergy and to drive from the throne two sovereigns, Joseph II. and William I., who desired to introduce freedom of conscience. In 1815 King William gave the Belgians the most liberal constitution on the continent. The bishops caused it to be rejected by the notables on the following ground: 'To swear to uphold freedom of religious opinions and the concession of equal protection to all faiths, what is this but to swear to uphold and protect error equally with the truth, to favor the progress of anti-Catholic doctrines and so to contribute towards the extinction of the light of the true faith in these fair regions. . . . There are, besides, other articles which a true child of the church can never bind himself to observe—such is the 227th which sanctions the freedom of the press.'"

For a long period confessors refused absolution to persons who had taken the oath of allegiance to the king.

In 1870 all Italy threw off the papal yoke, an emancipation which even those countries disposed to be most friendly towards the papacy not only officially sanctioned but rejoiced at.

M. Nigra, Italian Minister at Paris, wrote under date September 12, 1870, to the effect that he had notified the French minister of the order given to the Italian government to cross the pontifical frontier. M. Favre replied: "That the French government would let us do as we liked and sympathized with us."

The Austro-Hungarian government refused to protest.

Count Beust, Austro-Hungarian Chancellor, stated to the Italian Minister at Vienna that the Austro-Hungarian government "was satisfied with the ideas expressed in the circular of the 18th of October, and considered that the course which the Italian government had taken was reasonable and just and such as would conduce to an equitable solution." The circular goes on: "The temporal power of the Holy Father has ceased to exist . . . that compulsion in matters of faith, set aside by all modern states, found in the temporal power its last asylum. Henceforth all appeal to the secular sword must be suppressed in Rome itself."

Count Bray, Bavarian Minister, also accepted the change without protest.

Marshal Prim, Spanish Prime Minister, also congratulated the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italians on their entry into Rome, and the regent "manifested his satisfaction at the result of affairs at Rome."

The Minister of Portugal declared himself "beyond measure satisfied, praising much the moderation, good sense and the political tact of the government of his majesty (Victor Emmanuel) in such difficult circumstances."

In revenge for the seating of Amadeus, son of Victor Emmanuel, upon the Spanish throne, the Carlist insurrection occurred; an insurrection which received both the financial assistance and apostolic blessing of Pius IX.

In 1872 commenced the fight between the clericals and government of France; a fight which has continued with more or less fierceness ever since and has done much to retard the progress of the nation.

The fierce contest for supremacy between Prince Bismarck and the clericals of Germany is so largely a matter of well digested history that it needs but brief mention here, and I need only quote the Iron Chancellor's opinion of the clericals in March, 1872, when he said they were "the most evil element in parliament."

The expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany in 1872, after they had been expelled from nearly every civilized country in the world, suggests the conclusion that either the priesthood were desperately wicked and overbearingly and politically meddlesome, or that the nations of Europe did not appreciate a good thing when they possessed it. I am fully aware that the answer to the proposition is: The priests and popes have always been right and kings and governments invariably wrong. It is paying a tribute to papal tenacity to assert that the course pursued by Pius IX. in the "seventies" has been persisted in unremittingly ever since. Neither Pius IX. nor Leo XIII. has given the Italian king or government a moment's rest. The chief aim of the paparchy seems to have been anarchy and revolution, of which the Sicilian insurrection was a fair sample. The fact that priests were caught in red-handed complicity with lay conspirators leaves no shadow of a doubt as to the part played by the priesthood in that insurrection. In Hungary the fight of the clericals against the popular will and the government to prevent the passage of the Civil Marriages Bill, and after its passage to prevent its observance, is a matter of modern history that scarcely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needs to be recalled; while the bitter hostility of the clericals of Germany to the German Emperor for the purpose of enforcing the claims of the Jesuits is a subject of almost daily illustration in the public press.

I shall be asked, perhaps, "Why go to Europe to illustrate an American argument?" I reply that I go where the Church under discussion is best known, that I may ascertain her standing and reputation in respect of all those virtues to which she lays pretensions.

No one who is acquainted with history will aver that the papacy has not engaged extensively in politics in Europe to the great discomfort and annoyance of those nations in which she has practised them.

The question now is: Has she repented of the past and is she prepared to abandon politics and settle down in the American Republic upon the same basis as other sectarian institutions, and leave matters of state entirely in the hands of the people? The recent encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. would indicate that she has changed nothing except her methods of encroachment upon the rights of the state and the privileges of the people.

That her priests and laity have been the chief factors in American politics, recent events in New York would indicate. These political operations have neither been confined to the laity nor to the inferior ecclesiasts. It is not so many months since the Bishop of Rochester publicly attacked a brother prelate for interfering in the politics of New York. Not much importance it is true, was attached to the fact of the priests of the archdiocese of New York instructing parishioners from the pulpit which way to vote during the municipal elections last fall, yet the most trustworthy newspapers of New York vouched for the truth of the incident.

Some apologists for the papacy, even after these events had become public, had the hardihood to deny that papal priests were in politics, until it transpired that the Bishop of Sioux Falls, and a large number of inferior priests throughout the country, had publicly instructed their parishioners how and for whom they should vote. Still some were unconvinced as to the part papal theologians were playing in American politics until Archbishop Ireland, towards the end of May, came out in unmistakable terms upon the silver question.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I trust this settles the vexed question as to whether or not the papacy is in politics. That she has been in politics quite actively in the past, and that her influence in the political world has been almost twice as powerful as that of all other sects combined, the enormous appropriations granted to her by the government for the alleged education of the Indians will indicate, while the large number of special privileges enjoyed by her under State governments demonstrate conclusively that her political organization is as perfect locally as it is nationally.

The course pursued by the popes in Europe during the last century is being duplicated here with variations. The paparchy is a law unto herself and will accept no other. If constitutions differ from the spirit of canon law they must be modified to harmonize with it. The constitution of the United States makes the voice of the people the supreme law; the papal leaders add the amendment, "so long as it conforms with the law of the papal church," or words which embody that meaning.

Where the people are strong, where the state is powerful, the papacy is weak. The converse of this proposition is also true: hence the papal conspiracy to weaken our Republic by the union of Church and State, with the Church of Rome at the head.

While the Pope denies the right of the state to cross the domestic threshold and includes within the pale of domesticity the education of the young, he arrogates to the Church the right not only to intrude into the most sacred relations of family and home in the persons of her confessors, but dares to dictate to parents the course of instruction which the youth of America shall receive. Let the State concede this right and the rising generation will be Americans only in name, but in reality the subjects of a foreign paparchy. The perversion of the American constitution to conform to papal dogmas will then be only a matter of time, and the Republic as established by the signers of the Declaration of Independence be merely a memory.

What the open imperialism and arrogance of Gregory and Pius could never have accomplished in the United States, the superior diplomacy of the present Pontiff and his American prelates has partly succeeded in securing—the predominance of the papal church as a sect and the balance of power as a political body. While Pius administered allopathic doses of ultramontan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism and nauseated his subjects, Leo, while striving after the same end, contents himself with a slower but much more effective treatment of homœopathic liberalism.

However liberal a papist may be, he is a child of the Church and obedient to the voice of the Pope in all matters over which the Church claims jurisdiction; and when he accepts the Encyclical of January 6, 1895, the difference between him and the Ultramontane is so slight as to be imperceptible.

The paparchy seeks to renew in the new world the power of which she has been denuded in the old. While in Europe she used kings and councils as her tools, she adapts herself to American conditions here and intrudes herself into all the elements of our public life which contribute to our power. She organizes labor, not for labor's sake, but as an intimation to capital that she is mistress of the situation. She strives to obtain the balance of power in each political party and secures concessions to the Church which no other sect has ever sought or could obtain. She drives her subjects from secret societies which are legal under the constitution and declares them illegal, substituting her own laws for those of the people. She declares the civil marriage law of no effect and denies the right of her subjects to think, speak or write independently of the permission of the Bishop.

Those "liberal" Catholics who can digest all this cannot consistently reject whatever else the papal theological pharmacopœia may contain. "Liberal Catholicism" is but a term for a policy and means neither concession nor amendment. The papacy is to-day, as it ever was in the past, a despotism claiming universal jurisdiction; an end to be attained only by the weakening of governments and the transfer of the power of the people into the hands of the priests.

To combat these pretentions, to remove the hand of the Pope from the brain of the thinker and the writer, from the mouth of the speaker and the mind of the scholar, from the throat of the statesman and the will of the voter—the American Protective Association was organized. It will continue its work until popes have learned that under the American constitution as it now stands they have no right that is not possessed by the most insignificant member of the non-papal clergy or laity.

W. J. H. Traynor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FEMALE CRIMINALS.

BY MAJOR ARTHUR GRIFFITHS, HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTOR OF PRISONS.

Two Italian savants, Lombroso and Ferrero, both well known as earnest students of the new science of criminal anthropology, have recently directed their researches into the peculiarities of offenders of the weaker sex. Criminal woman has been brought under the mental microscope, her traits and idiosyncracies minutely and patiently examined. The process is much the same as that adopted in the investigation of the criminal man; the result also is similar. We have now put before us a particular type, a distinct and peculiar character, whose separate existence is supposed to be proved, based upon certain well established physical and physiological differences between her and the normal woman. It may be questioned, perhaps, whether we gain much by what has been elicited; whether the facts now published are not more curious than instructive. What useful purpose is served by this photographic portraiture of the female criminal is not exactly apparent, except perhaps that by recognizing criminal traits we are put upon our guard against those who exhibit them. Yet this might prove very inconvenient, sometimes; we might be led to quarrel with or misjudge our best friends. For we here touch upon the really weak spot, the one great flaw in the doctrines of the criminal anthropologist. It has no doubt been proved satisfactorily that evil-doers possess many purely personal qualities and characteristics; the awkward thing is that these same peculiarities are encountered also among the most exemplary members of society. To this the Lombroso school answers that these last have never been sufficiently tempted; that some day, given adequate inducement, they too, will certainly go astray. All that is left us, presumably, is to hope for the best; to con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinue to associate with those whose looks should hang them, trusting that their innate wickedness may never drive them to suddenly shock and surprise us by their misdeeds. But we may take heart of grace, for the whole position is otherwise assailable; this theory of the inherent instinctive impulse to crime in certain individuals, cursed with unsought but ineradicable imperfections, can be contested on other grounds. It is a well-known fact that evil-doers pass from the lesser to greater crimes; the old saying, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus,* is an everlasting truth. The criminal anthropologists have never yet explained how it is that the thief's nose, which is found to be a "turn up," does not become the "crooked" in the murderer, when the thief expands, as he so often does, into the more heinous criminal.

While dissenting, however, from his general conclusions, we may follow the scientist with interest through his experiments. He has discovered and classified many strange phenomena, the result of his examination of a not very large number of female offenders.

Lombroso finds that the typical female criminal has coarse black hair and a good deal of it; but this is obviously only true of Italians, there is no such general color among northern or Saxon races. She has often a long face, a receding forehead, over-jutting brows, prominent cheek-bones, an exaggerated frontal angle as seen in monkeys and savage races, and nearly always square massive jaws and a firm mouth. Lombroso insists strongly upon the last-named trait, as very generally present; the female offender is especially remarkable for her want of feminality. She is virile, masculine in voice and in figure, lank and meagre without the rounded forms, a chief beauty in the true woman, and able therefore, as in many well-known cases, to wear male attire without detection. The eyes of the female offender are said to be sunken, deep set, in color dark (only in the Italians, of course); wrinkles soon show, and in elderly women are strongly developed in certain parts of the face; the cranial capacity is inferior to that of the normal woman; there is a greater tendency to grow gray and to baldness; moles are common; hairiness, which is unusual and unfeminine, has been frequently found; strabismus also, and generally an unprepossessing appearance. Yet the offender in early years often possesses *la beauté de la jeunesse;* degeneracy does not show till the adipose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tissue has shrunk, then the salient cheek bones protrude, the lower jaw hardens, the complexion fades and wrinkles deepen. Although in subjects whose attractiveness is part of their stock in trade, beauty lingers through close attention to artificial allurements, the female offender grows more and more ugly with advancing years, till at last she becomes a hideous and repulsive old hag, with all her native blemishes and imperfections thrown up into strong relief.

Passing on to the mental or psychological characteristics, these also are strongly marked according to the Italian enquirers. It may be stated here, parenthetically, that the facts deduced in this respect rest on a broader basis. For the physical traits, but just enumerated, follow upon somewhat limited investigations; not as many as a hundred women in all having been examined. But as regards the mental qualities the professors have sought their illustrations far and wide, in all countries and all ages, and adduce some rather remote female criminals, such as the mother of Antaxerxes Messalina, Ta-ki of China, or such hackneyed cases as those of Brinvilliers, Tiquet, Lafarge, Jegado, and Gabrille Bompard, in support of their generalizations. For some strange reason, from ignorance perhaps, or possibly unfamiliarity with the English language, hardly any of the notorious female offenders in England are brought forward in evidence, although many would afford startling corroboration of the conclusions drawn. I propose, therefore, to refer to some of these in reviewing the psychological aspect of the female offender.

The vices most prominent in the feminine criminal are found to be great cruelty, a passionate temper rising quickly into extravagant fury, an excessive craving for revenge, low cunning strongly developed, greed, shameless rapacity, an inordinate love of lucre, mendacity to the utter contempt of all truthfulness. Such women are erotic, but not capable of pure, devoted love; they are weak in that maternal feeling which is usually the strongest sentiment in the feminine nature; they are given to dissipation, audacious, violent, imperious, dominating weaker characters whether of their own or of the opposite sex, their vices, in a word, are of the male rather than the female. In planning crimes they exhibit much deliberation, can bide their time with fiendish patience, following out their purpose with unshakeable, undeviating persistence, and when the moment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action arrives will strike without cowardly hesitation or any fear of future remorse. They are especially clever in instigating others to the commission of crime, using them as catspaws or agents, evading direct responsibility themselves, and being strenuously persistent in denial, in obstinate refusal to confess. All these traits have been proved over and over again to exist in the worst types of female criminals, but happily their combination in one individual is extremely rare. When found in full development they constitute a type of extraordinary wickedness which the world does not often see. These are the class of "born" criminals, the very worst specimen of female offenders, the women of whom writers speak as "more cynical, more depraved, more terrible than any form of criminal male." "The woman is seldom wicked," says the Italian proverb, "but when she is, she surpasses the man."

This, the worst type of female, the "born" criminal is not common in the softer sex. So much so that the scientists readily admit that the "occasional" criminals form the large majority of female criminals. The two classes indeed overlap constantly, and it seems hardly necessary to distinguish between them when discussing feminine criminology. Every woman who has once fallen, not only into crime, but from the strict paths of virtue, is probably capable of further, even the deepest, forms of degradation. Speaking broadly, she is either good or bad; when she is the first but has broken through the safeguards of moral restraint and lapsed into the second she may then drift on and downward into any kind of crime. This is generally accepted as an axiom by all who have had much experience with female offenders. The only distinction is one of degree; the worst only are wholly bad, exhibiting none or but few of the "contradictions," as Lombroso calls them, the redeeming qualities which so often raise them from the lowest levels.

Whatever, then, the class of offender, whether, adopting the Lombroso division, we speak of the "born" or the "occasional" criminal, in all alike the same traits are to be found only in a greater or lesser degree. The Italian theories of facial and physical characteristics may not be entirely convincing, being deduced as has been said from too narrow data and dealing with too few nationalities to be accepted as establishing any universal law. But I have found in criminal women, both in my reading and within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my own personal experience, which is not of yesterday, not only the mental traits and tendencies already enumerated, but others not mentioned by Lombroso. Many cases might be adduced in corroboration of the alleged cold-blooded, callous cruelty of the female murderess, the savage determination with which she carries out her fell purpose; no difficulties deter her, she can wait and watch for opportunity concealing her devilish intention under a smiling face, till at last she administers poison and strikes the blow with a nice calculation of effect. She seldom shrinks, seldom falters after the deed is done, either in facing consequences or removing traces. Catherine Hayes having caused her husband's death wished to cut off his head with a penknife and boil it; Mrs. Manning dug the grave for her victim, three weeks ahead, just in front of her kitchen fire, where she roasted and ate a goose the very afternoon of the crime. Kate Webster dismembered the corpse of her mistress and boiled it piecemeal; Hannah Dobbs strangled a lodger and dragged her body downstairs to bury it among ashes in a disused cellar. Dixblanc, the French cook who murdered Madame Riel in Park Lane, did much the same. Female cruelty of a still more revolting kind was displayed by Mrs. Brownrigg and the two Meteyards; the first of whom flogged her parish apprentices to death, having first starved and shamefully ill-used them; the latter were milliners who tortured their employees under the most disgusting circumstances, killing them with refined cruelty and afterwards chopping their bodies to pieces. Within quite recent years the Irish woman, Mrs. Montagu, rivalled these monsters by her fiendish cruelty to her own children, and in the Staunton case, although the men were the principal agents, the two women were included in the crime of taking an innocent life by cruel torture, "a deed," said the Judge, "so black and hideous as to be unparalleled in all the records of crime." Professor Lombroso makes no mention of any of these cases, which are certainly not less illustrative of cruelty than any in his book.

Among the mixed motives that compel women to great crimes greed stands high, then comes the desire for vengeance, the gratification of passionate hatred for real or fancied wrongs, the ungovernable outbreaks of fierce temper, the mad promptings of jealousy, for the female offender is an ardent lover, strong in love as in hate, and implacable when crossed or flouted. Sarah Malcolm, the charwoman, committed a triple

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murder, incited thereto by the sight of her mistress's wealth in coin and silver plate; the murder of O'Connor by the Mannings originated in the woman's cupidity, her thirst for her victim's possessions; it was the same with Kate Webster, Jessie McLachlan, and Hannah Dobbs. There have been numerous cases of child murder in England by mothers to secure insurance money, the policies often taken out on purpose by the inhuman parent, who has already doomed her offspring to death. Baby farmers have been driven by greed to practise atrocious cruelties on the infants committed to their tender mercies; cases innumerable might be quoted of the employment of poison (of which more directly) to gratify inordinate rapacity. Feminine rage, often the forerunner of mania, is most noticeable perhaps within prison walls, and it is sometimes so spontaneous, so persistent and terrible, as to be only explained by actual mental derangement. The woman McCarthy, who, in Millbank, stabbed a matron without a moment's warning, was, no doubt, a homicidal lunatic, but Flossie Fitzherbert was sane enough, and when she assaulted another matron and broke a medicine bottle into her skull she was carried away by momentary but quite uncontrollable ferocity. It was in a fit of passion of this kind that Dixblanc, chafing against what seemed unjust rebuke, turned on her mistress and struck her dead. For long-continued, indomitable ill-temper, the woman Julia Newman, who made Millbank hideous for nearly a year, will never be quite forgotten. Fierce feuds between the prisoners themselves continued from previous quarrels when free, or originating in new discords in durance, are of constant occurrence, leading at times to sanguinary conflicts, which but for prompt interference might have ended in loss of life. I have before my mind's eye the case of a woman whose loathing for a comrade was so intense that she could not be trusted within sight of her, and who made several attempts, happily abortive, to murderously assault her enemy.

Jealousy, as might be expected in the female subject, has impelled many to crime. It is now well known that Constance Kent, whose offence was only tardily proved on her own confession, did her infant brother to death because she was jealous of him, although on no very reasonable grounds. When sexual relations intervene the feeling is naturally intensified; many violent acts might be instanced in which outraged women have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sought to vent their disappointment on truant or unfaithful swains. When the woman of greatly perverted moral sense has been crossed in love, her thirst for vengeance has only been assuaged by the most terrible reprisals. One of the most hideous cases on record is perhaps that of Mary Blandy, who poisoned her father because he would not consent to her marriage with Captain Cranstown, whom he knew to be a miscreant and unprincipled fortune hunter.

Poisoning is a crime, peculiarly attractive to the female offender, as is proved by the hundreds of cases in which it has been perpetrated by them in times past and present. As I have written elsewhere, "its chief recommendation to them is its simplicity and the many facilities that are offered for its commission to a sex so generally employed as mistress, housewife, nurse or cook." It is a strange fact and a further illustration of this contention that according to the last statistics of crime in the United States as furnished by the Census Bulletin of 1892, as many as 244, out of a general total of 393 female homicides were committed by women in "personal service," or, speaking more in detail, by 26 housewives, 50 housekeepers, 138 servants, 16 washerwomen and 10 nurses. No information is available of the method employed, but it may be safely inferred that poison was largely used. This would only be in harmony with all criminal experience. The crime which commended itself to Lucretia Borgia and Brinvilliers is still deplorably prevalent and we have our Maybricks, Cheshams, Catherine Wilsons, Christina Edmunds and Madeline Smiths in modern days. These and other cases to which Lombroso makes no reference are not likely to be soon forgotten; as that of Rebecca Smith who confessed on the scaffold, when about to suffer for poisoning her baby one month old, that she had already poisoned seven other children; of Chesham who, imitating the harridans who invented and sold Aqua Tofana, confessed that she had for years carried on a large business in removing husbands, both her own and others. Catherine Wilson was a wholesale poisoner whose foul practices were in all cases inspired by greed and who first used, if she did not actually discover, the properties of colchicum, the pretty violet flower of the meadow-saffron so familiar in Swiss summer fields, in the form of a slow and not easily detected poison. Fanny Oliver used prussic acid to get rid of a husband who was insured in a burial society; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Madame Lafarge, whose case, being enveloped in much mawkish sentimentality, attracted world-wide attention at the time, did her husband to death with arsenic, the true "bungler's" or "beginner's" weapon, as its symptoms and the traces it leaves are so easily detected.

The typical female poisoner, however, was Anna Zwanziger or Anna Schönleben, known as the German Brinvilliers, whose crimes were committed about the commencement of the present century. It is somewhat strange that this woman has also escaped the attention of Lombroso, for she exemplifies some of the most remarkable criminal traits, and her picture as handed down to us is so much direct evidence upon the outward aspect of her species. Zwanziger was of small stature, thin, deformed, her sallow meagre face deeply furrowed by passion as well as by age. Her eyes expressed envy and malice; her brow was perpetually clouded; her manner cringing, servile and affected; age and ugliness had not diminished her craving for admiration. Mock sensibility, and weak moral sense and an undoubted taste for dissipation led her into evil courses at an early age, and left her at fifty reduced to the greatest poverty, homeless, friendless, and at her wit's end to live. It was then that she adopted poisoning as a means of livelihood, as a profession, and her own exultant account of the power it conferred on her may be commended to those who are interested in the psychological analysis of the female criminal mind.

Her attachment to poison was based upon the proud consciousness that it gave her the power to break through every restraint, to attain every object, to gratify every inclination; she could deal out death or sickness as she pleased, torture all who offended her or stood in her way; she could revenge herself through it for every slight; it amused her to see the contortions of her victims; she could get fellow-servants and others into trouble, throw suspicion upon any innocent persons whom she disliked. If she wished to bring a married man to her feet, she might murder his wife when she chose; if she hankered after the possessions of others, she might acquire them when the poison had done its work. As time went on she became an expert toxicologist; mixing and giving poison was her constant occupation. She was so devotedly attached to this deadly familiar friend that she carried it always about with her, and when arrested and some arsenic was found in her pocket, "she seemed to tremble with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pleasure and gazed upon the white powder with eyes beaming with rapture." When sentenced to capital punishment she told the judge that her death was fortunate for mankind, as it would have been impossible for her to discontinue her trade of poisoning. There can be no question that Zwanziger fully fills up the type of "born" criminal; she was in truth a veritable monster, an incarnate female fiend.

It is agreeable to turn from these sombre details, from the black traits that show criminal women at their worst, and which, as has been said, are rare in their fullest development, to the smaller foibles, the blemishes, the blameworthy but not deeply criminal failings of their everyday life, mainly as seen when under restraint. Some of these the female offender shares with her more virtuous and immaculate sister, but shows in an aggravated and exaggerated form; the vanity, for instance, which is strong even in the inmates of a prison; the intolerance of control and of constituted authority, for what in the best is mere obstinacy or self assertion becomes in the worst direct defiance; the persistent misconduct, the fluent, shrewish tongue that will not be silenced; perversity in fact so marked as to be nearly unmanageable and incurable, especially when associated with a readiness to graver offence, or a morbid tendency to surrender and despair. On the other hand female prisoners have some pleasing traits; gratitude is very common among them, they are always sensible to kindness and sympathy, and can in truth be more easily governed through the gentler influences than by stern, unyielding discipline. A very curious trait taken in connection with the maintenance of good order in a female prison is the strong inclination of the inmates towards combined disorder. There is a contagion of misconduct, if I may so call it, which spreads with strange rapidity through a prison; it may be the peculiar imitativeness of the feminine character, the ready yielding to example even in ill doing, but whatever the cause the effect is frequently observed by others as well as myself. When one woman "breaks out," many more, if within reach of her influence whether by sight or sound, will follow suit. This is why "breaking out," a favorite but not always intelligible sin against good order and which shows itself in wholesale destruction of property and personal effects, cell furniture, window panes, woodwork, bedding, clothes, seldom occurs in isolated instances; why, many years ago, the sudden

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fancy to drum upon the inside of a cell with the soles of her feet which took one prisoner, soon extended to a whole ward; why if a few are insubordinate, the whole female prison is transformed speedily into a bear garden.

Vanity in a female prisoner would be merely laughable if it were not so sad to behold. It is, however, the one touch of nature which proves the human kinship, and there is perhaps some hope for even these poor degraded creatures if they are thus swayed by such harmless emotions. Prison matrons would be perpetually busy if they checked every attempt made by their charges to adopt the last fashionable coiffure; "fringes" are "going out" perhaps in general society, but they are still amazingly popular in prison. Criminals will trim their hair as it pleases them, and the wisest disciplinarian affects to see nothing of the fringe. In the same way, once, when chignons were in vogue, the female felt happy whose locks escaped the prison scissors and were long enough to fold over a pad of oakum. The ingenuity, again, with which some prisoners will twist and turn their unbecoming uniform into some faint notion of the fashions of the day might have earned these artists good wages in a dressmaker's *atelier*; I have seen panniers counterfeited and polonaises, skirts draped or tied back, dress improvers manufactured out of whalebones or horsehair; no doubt, when the present "bell" skirt is fading out of fashion it will be largely patronized in jail. The craze for personal adornment leads women to skim the grease off their scanty allowance of soup, with which they plaster their hair. I once knew an aged prisoner who was caught scraping the dust from the red brick cell wall to serve her as rouge.

Some more estimable qualities may be noticed. I must contest Lombroso's theory that maternal affection is generally wanting among female offenders; it is directly contradicted by my experience. I have found "the children's ward" quite a model nursery, and prisoner mothers exemplary in their care and attention. It may be that when at large, relieved from the controlling eye of authority, the criminal is less affectionate, but I much question whether she is any worse than others of her class. Another good point in the female (as well as in the male) in durance, is her unwearied patience and devotion in nursing the sick. Of course it may be urged, *per contra*, that here again she is under super-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vision, that hospital work forms an agreeable change to the monotony of prison routine; still with all due deductions the fact remains that the prisoner nurse is deft-fingered, soft-footed, watchful and kindly in her ministrations. The sympathy for the sick is extended even to the officers over them, and I am forcibly reminded of the case of a matron whose slow death of malignant disease was touchingly respected by the universal and spontaneous resolve of all the prisoners to "give no trouble" during her last illness. It was usually a very unruly prison, too.

Of the gratitude which lies low in the offender's heart, but which can be reached by judicious treatment, I shall quote but one instance. It is that given in Scougal's *Scenes from a Silent World*, an admirable monograph on prison life. A hardened offender, one with sixty-four convictions against her—Lombroso would have classed her as a "born" criminal—arrived scowling and sullen under a fresh sentence. Her conduct corresponded with her sullen demeanor and was continuously defiant and refractory, until an unofficial visitor took her in hand. Then "she became a totally changed being—gentle, obedient, and deeply grateful to those whom she found to her utter amazement to be really anxious to help and comfort her." It was there she had first met with pity or kindness from her fellow-creatures, and the first touch of human sympathy melted her despair as sunshine softens ice.

Among the many dicta of the criminal anthropologists is the assertion that primitive woman was not given to wrong-doing, and that the female offender is a product of civilization, increasing with it. This theory may be supported, perhaps, by wider and more general investigations made, but it is certainly not proved by English experience. Nothing is more remarkable in the annals of crime than its steady diminution among females in England in recent years. In the last decade there has been a decrease of 41 per cent. in the total numbers imprisoned, comparing 1892-3 with 1882-3. Although the prison population cannot be taken as a final test of the conditions of crime, the fact cannot be overlooked when the decrease is so strongly marked. Moreover, during these ten years there has been a general increase of the population of 25 per cent. If the statistics are sifted and the figures taken according to the gravity of misdeeds and sentences, the decrease is still more surprising. The average total of convicts, the females, that is to say who have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been sentenced to penal servitude for terms of three years and upwards, was in 1892–3 just 245, as against 887 in 1882–3, a diminution of 72 per cent.; in the "local" prisons, those for lesser terms and offences, the decrease has been 33 per cent., but the two combined give the figure already quoted of 41 per cent. Another highly satisfactory feature is found by examining the figures further and comparing the ages of criminals in custody. This clearly shows that the principal decrease has occurred among the younger criminals, in other words, that the supply is being cut off at the source, that fewer recruits are enlisted or drawn into the great army of crime. But the older habitual criminals continue to flock in; nothing seemingly will eradicate the poison when it has once been taken into the system; the woman who has fallen into evil ways seldom recovers her position. Now in 1892–3 the largest proportion of female prisoners in custody is still represented by those who have been most often convicted; in 1882–3 this total was 9,316, in 1892–3 it was 9,408. Sharply contrasted with these figures the first convictions, or those who have been convicted but once, show up in the manner already described. While these in 1882–3 were 7,008, now in 1892–3 there were only 4,377.

A further but somewhat remote diminution may be expected when the old hands gradually disappear. But this process of depletion will be slow; for, strange to say, the criminal woman seems to thrive in prison. Her longevity, not in the general population alone, but among the so-called dangerous classes especially, is established beyond all doubt. "It is a well-known fact," says Lombroso, "that the number of aged female criminals surpasses the male contingent." This he explains on the theory that women have greater powers of resistance to misfortune. "This is a well-known law which in the case of the female criminal seems almost exaggerated, so remarkable is her longevity and the toughness with which she endures the hardships, even the prolonged hardships of prison life. . . . I know some denizens of female prisons who have reached the age of 90, having lived within those walls since they were 29 without any grave injury to health." It is pretty obvious from this that criminal women stand punishment better than men.

ARTHUR GRIFFITHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"TENDENCIES" IN FICTION.

BY ANDREW LANG.

If we are trying to understand the "tendencies," the main currents and back-waters of thought and sentiment, in any past age, we do not pay particular attention to its light literature. Plays and novels of the past give little of the grave information which we seek in old works of philosophy, history and theology. People used to keep their play and their earnest apart with some success. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. Greek plays contain the most profound religious and philosophic reflections of the period, but if any one calls Greek plays light literature, we "disable his judgment." And, even in this field, as time went on, and discussion abounded, and sophists multiplied, and theorists took aim at every conceivable object, we find Euripides filling his dramas with perfectly modern "tendencies." Euripides revels in "problems," as much as any lady novelist who writes under a masculine name takes pleasure in rare moral or immoral "situations." For this very quality Aristophanes, like a good literary Tory, assails Euripides. His characters exhibit on the stage, before all Athens, positions which it would be wiser not to discuss at all. The drama becomes a debating room of matters better left undebated to the verdict of tradition. The passion of a brother for a sister is one of these risky situations, riskier than the modern British novelist is likely to attempt. But here was a "problem," and Euripides was as fond of a "problem" as Dr. Ibsen.

These things are the exceptions. In all the plays of Shakspeare, in an age when the drama was to the world what the novel is to-day, how little we find of "tendencies." The great contemporary "problem" was the sequel to the English Reformation. The British middle classes, like John Knox, who refused an Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish bishopric, conceived that the English Reformation had not gone nearly far enough. There were still plenty of "idols" to break; plenty of beauty in religious ceremonial was left to destroy, numerous illogical formulæ were to be swept away. The Puritans, "a sect of perilous consequence," said Elizabeth, "such as would have no kings but a presbytery," were waxing great in the land. The attempt at a theocracy was maturing, but about all this we find, in Shakspeare, next to nothing. Sir Andrew Aguecheek, who did not give his "exquisite reason," declared his dislike of a Puritan,—in Illyria,—but of debates on Puritanism Shakspeare gives us none. His own shade of religious opinion is disputed to this day. The great early colonial efforts of his time are not more prominent in his works. The "problems" of Hamlet or of Jacques are the eternal, not the temporary or exceptional, problems of humanity.

As for tendencies in novels, till the middle of the eighteenth century, at earliest, novels were written merely for human pleasure. "Bold bawdry and open manslaughter," says Ascham, were their themes in the Elizabethan age. Love and fighting, to use more friendly and even more accurate language, were still the topics of fiction. Fielding and Richardson had their confessed moral and social purposes, especially Fielding; but they subordinated these to the story and to the play of character. Sheer romance prevailed with Mrs. Radcliffe, Miss Porter, and the totally forgotten novelists of chivalry and mediæval history, whose fame, if they had any, was swallowed up in that of Scott. He, of course, was a romancer pure and simple; so, in essentials, were Bulwer Lytton, and Cooper, and even Hawthorne, despite his allegory, for Hawthorne loved old moral ideas for their romantic possibilities. Yet even Disraeli, in *Sybil*, anticipated our modern tales about social problems, and M. Taine, not quite unjustly, censured the eternal moral purpose of Thackeray. *The Newcomes* is a long parable of loveless marriages, the theme is insisted on with tedious iteration. Dickens, too, sacrificed much to tendencies; several of his tales are pamphlets directed at abuses, but then his are amusing pamphlets. We can endure plenty of purpose and plenty of preaching from novelists who are humorists. But, after the deaths of our great novelists, the novel, somehow, has become a more and more potent literary engine; till, like Aaron's rod, it has swallowed up all the other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

species of literature. When the public says "literature," the public means novels,—and new novels. We can scarcely be said to have any new historians who are read as Macaulay was read, or as Mr. Froude, or Gibbon, or Carlyle were read. The public does not care for history; recently a novelist delivered a lecture in which Prince Charles was said to be the lover of Beatrice Esmond! Such novelist's history is as accurate as Miss Aikin's account of the Rising of 1715, begun, according to her, in the interests of a king who was dead, and led by a prince who was not born. In philosophy Mr. Herbert Spencer has shot his bolt, or rather, has emptied his quiver, and Darwin is lost in the Darwinians. We have, indeed, Biblical critics, or we borrow them from Germany. But History, Philosophy, Theology, are not now read as our fathers read them, in works of Theology, Philosophy, and History. These branches of literature now exist merely as "stock,"—in the culinary sense,—for novels. In I forget what South Sea isle, the women chew a certain root, and the liquid thus extracted is the beverage of the men. So modern novelists, reading grave works, or reading articles about them, produce the novel of philosophy, of theology, of "tendency" and "problem" for the pensive, but indolent public. History itself reaches the world in historical novels. Miss Pardoe's works on the French Court, and Mr. Parkman's excellent book on the Jesuits in Canada, are "stock" for Dr. Doyle's *Refugees*, and I fear that no more of Mr. Parkman's labors really reaches the English public. Every matter of discussion, however esoteric,—the relations of the sexes, the foundations of belief, the distribution of wealth,—is mixed up with "a smooth love tale," and thus the cup of learning, as Lucretius recommends, has honey smeared on its lips, and is drained by the thirsty soul. I prefer my jam and my powder separate, for one, and, if I want to know about Lourdes, turn rather to French physiologists and psychologists, than to the novel of M. Zola. But this is not the general taste, with which it were vain to quarrel. Interested in many grave and in some repulsive matters, the public declines to study these themes in the treatises of specialists, and devours them when they are sandwiched between layers of fiction.

This taste is in itself a "tendency" worth noting, and necessarily the novels of an age like ours are replete with tendencies. We are humanitarian, and so are our novels; revolutionary, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so are our novels. All institutions are brewing in a witch's cauldron, wherein the novelist drives his hook, like the sons of Eli, and brings forth matters good or bad.

Women, naturally, take the lead in an industry to which their desultory and amateur education conducts them. I am not speaking, of course, about the accomplished author of *David Grieve*, whose education and knowledge are thorough and manly, and who does not make hysterics her favorite *motif*. But hysterics really seem to be the chief literary motive of some strangely popular lady authors. The tendency represented in their novels is the revolt of some women against the Nature of Things, and especially against the nature of their sex. They want to have all the freedom which men exercise, even that which they exercise contrary to the acknowledged laws of Christian morals. Licentiousness, the claim "to enjoy," as lady novelists call it, at random, is bad enough in men, but in men it does not cause a break up of the family, and a reduction of society to something much below the state of the Digger Indians. For women "to enjoy," that is, to behave like the nymphs of Otaheite in the *Antijacobin*, is, manifestly, to leave the new generation in the posture of young cuckoos bereft even of the comforts of a thrush's or a sparrow's nest. This obvious fact in natural history has always been regarded as a bar to the indiscriminate license of women. Horace condoles with them; *miserarum est neque amori dare ludum*, and so forth; but some of the hysterical ladies maintain their assertion of feminine equality in these matters. Though their works make a talk, and are devoured as stolen fruit, it is not likely that this particular "tendency" will do much harm. "Offences must needs come," but scandals about girls are not, perhaps, so numerous now as they have been in several other less earnest periods. Women are, on the whole, naturally averse to following the path pointed out by the more daring romancers of their sex. Again, the exceptions who want to "live up," or rather down, to their favorite novels are usually unattractive, and therefore, by the selfishness of wicked man, are condemned to theory.

Quite another kind of freedom, and of equality with mankind, is claimed and acted on by two recent English heroines. Each of these young ladies knocks down her old aunt! One of them explains that, while she deeply regrets her impulsive conduct, *men* have the privilege of expressing passion in *voies de fait*, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the French have it. So why not women? Well, one might put it to the *Superfluous Woman* that men do not knock down their aunts, nor even their uncles. Give woman an inch, and she will take an ell, in the matter of liberty and privilege. This *Superfluous Woman* perhaps represents the high water mark of hysterics in female fiction. The heroine, a pretty and wealthy girl, is dying of *ennui* before she is twenty-one, if my chronology is correct. Girls of twenty, with beauty on their side, and triumph before them, do not sicken of *ennui*. "They have a bully time." In a few seasons matters alter; the vanity and vulgarity, the tedium and desolation of ceaseless pleasure hunting begin to tell, begin to be felt. The dose of "excitement" has to be increased, fiercer and stronger ingredients are added, and the girl ends in a Sisterhood, in a loveless marriage with the usual results, as a public character and topic of tattle, or, more commonly, as a weary, wandering old maid. But girls of twenty are not *blasées* to death, and, like the Sirens in Pontus de Tyard, *ennuyées jusques a desespoir*. In a recent tale, *The Maiden's Progress*, Miss Hunt has drawn, with much cleverness, the slow progress of *ennui* in the flirting spinster. But she is good natured, and lets her heroine easily off at the end. Generations of girls have I seen, gathering roses while they might, and then gathering nettles and thistles, seen them with pleasure, and soon with pity; watched their weariness and forced feverish gaiety. But a pretty girl bored to death at twenty saw I never.

The *Superfluous Woman* takes to a hectic kind of philanthropy: flies to the North, falls in love with a Caledonian farmer who is great at putting the stone, has an erotic and not very intelligible scene with him in a barn, finds him very unlike Robbie Burns in any similar situation, hurries South, knocks down her old aunt, marries an idiot peer, bears superfluous idiots, is haunted by a "Thing" with claws, and so forth, and so forth. This novel then seems to be a sea-wrack left at the highwater mark of hysteria. The book has been a good deal tattled about in print: it represents a "tendency"—the tendency to hysterics—and, as for the heroine, she wanted the attentions of Dr. Playfair or of Dr. Weir Mitchell, or she needed to be married at seventeen. "The green sickness" was very familiar to our ancestors, but they did not write novels about it.

It is not my opinion that the author of this eccentric romance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wants to do harm; very far from it; she plainly regards herself as a moralist. Indeed they all do; all are very earnest ladies, including, doubtless, the author of *The Heavenly Twins*. But I have never been able to read that work, and have only met one of my own sex who had done so. Some, indeed, I have seen driven to this water by their lady wives, but they did not drink; they could not drink. Thus, as the ladies will not tell me the plot, and men cannot, I am unable to pronounce an opinion about the "tendencies" of *The Heavenly Twins*. *The Yellow Aster*, on the other hand, I have read some of, laying the book down where the heroine, who married out of curiosity, was so shocked by the usual "consekinses of that manœuvre," as the elder Mr. Weller says. The heroine was pleasant as Boadicea, painted blue, in childhood. Her agnostic parents I seem to have met somewhere before, in fiction. The character of the heroine is beyond me, but, if she is as rare as a Yellow Aster, it is of no importance. Long may girls like her be *introuvables*. The writer, unlike most of her peers, is not wholly destitute of humor.

Minora canamus. I have read a good deal of *Dodo*, and also the remarks on *Dodo*, published in an American journal, by "T. W. H." Am I wrong in conjecturing that Colonel Higginson is the critic? At all events T. W. H. draws a parallel between Dodo and Daisy Miller as exhibiting "the feminine low water-mark of the two nations." I congratulate you, if Daisy is your low water-mark, for I am, and have long been, in love with that pretty and amiable enchantress. She had a foolish vulgar mother, and no breeding, but *enfin*, Daisy is Daisy, and we all adore her. She did not die; Mr. Henry James resuscitated her in the play which he wrote about her. Dodo, on the other hand, is a detestable minx, and her eternal patter has no wit to recommend it. If Dodo is our low water-mark, and if Daisy is yours, we are lost indeed. But, if *French* novelists are right, you have a water-mark much lower than Daisy; and if some of your own novelists are right, I prefer your low water-mark to your high. Nay, surely there are worse lasses in America than pretty, innocent, pathetic Daisy. You are mortal, after all.

But there are other considerations. Such a yell was raised against Mr. James for his little masterpiece, that only very unusual courage would enable an American novelist to draw American woman at a lower water-mark. We, here, say what we please

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thackeray could draw Blanche Amory and Becky, without being called a bad Englishman. You know what happened to Mr. Henry James, when he sketched an American girl, not bad (as some think Becky was), not a petty minx, as Blanche was, but *mal élevée*. Mr. James was said to have libelled his countrywomen, or a class of his countrywomen. That was his crime. Now, pray observe, Dodo is not supposed by T. W. H. to represent English women, nor even a class of English women. In England we never dreamed of thinking that Dodo represented a class. On the other hand, the author of the novel was said, no doubt hastily, to have sketched a living person. To have done so would have been to commit an outrage. T. W. H. speaks of "the supposed original" and mentions that "she was recently married." If all this were true, Dodo would, of course, be not a type, but a real person; no class of English women would be represented by her. As a matter of fact, the author of *Dodo* did not even know in the most casual manner, the person to whom T. W. H. obviously refers. Again, the crime of Dodo, is, in my opinion, that she is a chattering bore. But T. W. H. complains of her guilt in "neglecting a too loyal husband," in leaving her child to dance with an old lover, and in dancing skirt dances, as it were, on the grave of the babe. Well, if the "original" was married *after* the publication of the novel (as T. W. H. says), obviously the fancied original cannot have been guilty of the excesses which T. W. H. so justly reprobates. But it is all of no importance. Dodo, if we accept all this gossip, is not a type of English woman, but is an individual. Daisy, on the showing of Mr. James's enemies, represented a class. The Dodo is an extinct bird; or was copied from *la belle Stuart*, in Grammont. The only "tendency" worth noticing, is the very general tendency to detect personal caricature in fiction. "Society" novels, bad at best, are apt to sin in such caricatures, drawn by dull people who do not even know the originals. Moreover, even if there were a real Dodo, she could not become the founder of a sect. *Ne faict ce tour qui veult.*

And now shall we discuss *Les Demi Vierges?* No, because the society, the bad society, is that of cosmopolitan Paris. We are not responsible for the vagaries of that international chaos.

Happily there are other "tendencies" than those of frivolity, fashion, bad taste, vice, sham social science, sciolistic theology,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and hysterics. There is the good old tendency to love a plain tale of adventure, of honest loves, and fair fighting. We have Gentlemen of France, we have knob-nosed Kaffirs and battles with sacred crocodiles, we have *The Prisoner of Zenda*, that pleasingly incredible scion of German royalty, we have *Micah Clarke*, and *The White Company*, and Mr. Stevenson's Highlanders and Lowlanders. Here is primitive fiction: here is what men and boys have always read for the sheer delight of the fancy. The heroines are stainless and fair, the men are brave and loyal, the villains come to a bad end, and all this is frankly popular. We have no Scott, we have no Dickens, we have no Fielding, but we have honest, upright romancers, who make us forget our problems and the questions that are so much with us, in the air of moor and heath, on the highway, on the battlefield, in the deadly breach. Our novels in this kind are not works of immortal genius: only five or six novelists are immortal. But the honest human nature that they deal with, the wholesome human need of recreation to which they appeal,—these are immortal and universal.

ANDREW LANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOLUTION OF WAR.

BY THE REV. DR. H. PEREIRA MENDES.

THE solution of war is Palestine.

"Palestine?" readers will ask. "How can that or any other country affect the abstract question of how to abolish war?"

The cessation of war! What a dream! What a consummation to be devoutly wished for!

Let calm, practical, sober logic be heard, and thousands of men of common-sense will say it can never be.

But it is just calm, practical, sober logic which we would invoke in order to show how great a step forward even this generation can take in the direction of the reign of law, the rule of right, the cessation of war, and the maintenance of peace.

For what can be more calm, more practical, more sober logic than that which is associated with the domain of the lawyer? And it is to the lawyer, the passionless lawyer, we must look for the initial labor, and for much more than is initial, in the attempt to attain this much-desired end.

For undoubtedly it must be conceded that the power, gradually developed, which has tended to prevent wars by diplomatic effort —and in many an instance, has actually succeeded—is what is known as international law. It follows, therefore, that for its further efficacy or potency we must look to the masters of law, who alone can unfold its possibilities.

International law has proved its usefulness many times and in many directions.

In the minds of ordinary readers it is usually identified with such questions as harbor, river, or fishery rights, rights of belligerents, protectorates, annexations, residents or capital in foreign countries, navigation of the high seas, search rights, three-mile limits, extradition, Monroe doctrine, protection *versus* free-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade, international copyright, patent or trade-mark law, international cables, canals, tunnels, etc.

But as stated by Professor Amos, of University College, London, England, it has these additional functions to perform:

(*a*) To facilitate intercourse of states and their citizens in time of peace.

(*b*) To obviate and determine the occasions of war.

(*c*) To moderate the severities and restrict the area of war.

A clear comprehension of international law is essential for diplomatic settlement of international differences, and for the extension of a recognition of its utility, wisdom, and justice.

Hence a codification is imperatively demanded in the interests of peace, progress, and human happiness, to all of which war is so distinctly inimical.

This codification should and would be 'the embodiment of the purest reason and the loftiest morality." It would have for its sole end such an adjustment of the relations of the several states of the world as would best enable each to contribute its share to the welfare and moral advancement of all.

This would require a congress of the recognized leading jurists of the world to form a scientific opinion upon the existing state of international law; to gather, collate, sift, and point all principles and rules which affect or are likely to affect international intercourse, and to correct unjust precedents.

This would be a legitimate evolution from the beginnings of Balthasar Ayala, Alberico Gentili, Grotius, Pufendorf and Vattel, from the attempt of Prof. Bluntschli to correct "glaring gaps, contradictions, and ambiguities," and from Mr. Dudley Field's able effort to present international law in an ideal form.

Such a codification would be the first step towards the prevention of war. And the prayers of the civilized world would be with the governments convening such a congress of jurists, as with the jurists themselves in their labors.

The second step would be the education of public opinion:—

(1) To recognize the equality of populations, morally and spiritually, and to understand that even the smallest states have rights and functions which ought to be respected.

(2) To encourage commercial and social intercourse between nations and the consequent growth of mutual interests which may not be lightly imperilled.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) To extend proper political franchise and personal liberty.

(4) To cultivate a knowledge of what war means.

(5) To correct spurious patriotism, by which we mean patriotism based upon wrong or unjust argument. For example, French patriotism cries for Alsace and Lorraine, but these provinces were originally German. Why blame Germany for taking back what once was hers? German patriotism says "Keep Alsace and Lorraine, because they were originally German." Why then does not Germany restore Silesia, which properly is Austrian? Italy made a grand and successful fight for Italian independence, Germany for German unity. Several powers strove nobly and sucessfully for the independence of Greece. But the "spurious patriotism" of the powers which "partitioned" Poland prevents the independence and unity of that country—a country once not impotent in the councils of Europe's nations and one to which Europe is as much indebted for hurling back the tide of Mohammedan invasion through her king Sobieski, as it is to Greece for stemming the tide of Persian invasion through a Leonidas or a Themistocles.

Russia expels Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in pursuance of the "Russia for the Russians" policy. The civilized world calls that a "spurious patriotism" which drives out or coops up law-abiding and industrious citizens. The United States is, of all nations on earth, the most solemnly pledged to further the cause of popular and constitutional liberty, of which she is the very apostle. Yet a "spurious patriotism" makes her pronounce invariably for Russia, where there is anything but popular or constitutional liberty—shall we say especially where England is concerned? Never is American patriotism more spurious than when it is called forth against that very England to which she owes so much that is glorious in her fibre, her sentiments, her literature, her institutions, her liberties, and most important of all, her very religion! Never is it more spurious and more regrettable than when it impedes the natural destiny of Anglo-Saxondom—ultimate union to the real advantage of each of its constituent nations.

Following the codification of international law and the education of public opinion, a third step towards the prevention of war would be the institution of arbitration as an accepted principle, and its recognition as the duty and prerogative of an international court, duly and permanently established.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to the actual and possible wrongs of war we need only recapitulate its costs and curses, viz. :

(*a*) Standing armies, or millions of men consumers instead of producers; the general community therefore not only taxed to support them, but deprived of their contributions toward the general prosperity and toward the lessening of the general burdens.

(*b*) The withdrawal of just so many brains and pairs of hands from the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and other industries, and from laboratory, study, and office, wherein means are devised for enterprises which would supply work for thousands of men and women, to the increase of the country's resources.

The following figures are significant :

	Cost of army and navy.	Revenue.	Men withdrawn from industrial pursuits.	Taxes could be reduced.
France	$174,000,000	$670,000,000	500,000	One-quarter.
England.....	180,000,000	488,000,000	360,000	One-third.
Germany...	118,000,000	300,000,000	500,000	One-third.
United States.	80,000,000	385,818,629	30,000	One-fifth.

In twenty European states the cost of army and navy is $1,638,000,000; debt, $25,000,000,000 ; soldiers, or men withdrawn from industrial pursuits, available 22,621,800 ! That is to say, there are 22,000,000 standing arguments against a religion of peace and good will ; 22,000,000 arguments against any claim for a civilization more ethical than that of old Rome ; 22,000,000 arguments to show that it is time to make religion a power for good— the life-influencing power it was meant to be.

(*c*) War means "glorious victories," which term, translated into plainer English, means thousands of widows, more orphans, countless broken hearts, shadowed lives and shattered homes ; brave men killed, more wounded, yet more stricken with diseases caught in the field ; strong men made burdens for life on the community ; and in this country the awful scandal and far-reaching injustice of the pension list.

(*d*) War means military and naval budgets, which summon the clouds of national bankruptcy and keep aglow the embers of discontent. Witness Italy to-day.

(*e*) Legacies of national hatred, jealousy, and ill-feeling. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

note a regrettable change in French sentiment towards England, due to clashing Eastern interests. Imagine war between France and Great Britain! They have been friends for decades and are bound by myriad ties. It is no impossibility. But what a blot on civilization! They would be face to face as foes in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America! It would mean a spread of the blood lust which lurks in men's hearts. It would mean endless complications. Few countries in the world but would feel them. Few homes in both lands but would sympathize with hearts dark with the shadow of death. Few hearts but would be wrung with the echoing moan of sorrow. Alas! It would mean kinsman against kinsman.

(*f*) War means the brute argument of tooth and claw. What an insult to our intelligence! What an insult to Christianity, the religion professed by earth's great nations! Yet we are told that preparation for war is a necessity. Gladstone expressed his misgivings to a parliamentary deputation, asking that overtures be made for a mutual disarmament of the powers, and he spoke as premier of England! Caprivi put his foot on the mere proposition! And he spoke as Chancellor of mighty Germany.

Arbitration is suggested as a remedy.

The examples already offered, especially by England and the United States, are brilliant pages in the annals of humanity.

From a paper of Professor Semmes, of the Louisiana University, read at the recent Chicago Religious Congress, we learn that the idea and practice of arbitration for national differences have steadily gained ground. This is the best, because most practical, argument for its utility. He says that from 1793 to 1848, a period of fifty-five years, there were nine such arbitrations—only nine. In the next twenty-two years there were fifteen, in the next ten years there were fourteen, and in the last thirteen years there have been thirteen; that is to say, in the last forty-five years arbitration has averted forty-two wars.

But arbitration has its dangers. The care which must be exercised in selecting arbitrators shows to what an extent distrust exists.

Small powers are often chosen, as if the greater the power, the greater the possibilities of interests being involved which might warp judgment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For example. Suppose England and Russia clash in the East—no remote contingency—can England accept France as arbitrator? Not at all. For France is irate with England and is the sworn friend of Russia, upon whose power alone she relies for help against the Dreibund. Nor would any of the latter be acceptable to Russia. And it is useless concealing the spurious patriotism which makes the United States imagine that her interests lie in the weakening or humiliation of England, a sentiment which sufficiently excludes her good offices.

Another possible complication is France and Russia *versus* the Dreibund. England is out of the question as arbitrator, and the United States leans too much for obvious reasons, to France and Russia.

But let us ask: Does it accord with the dignity of the great powers to ask a second-rate or third-rate power to arbitrate?

A modification of arbitration is that it be submitted to competent lawyers. But natural, even though it be spurious, patriotism again enters here as a possible element, and *amour propre* is not an impotent factor in judgment.

Granted that kings, statesmen, and lawyers of high repute are gentlemen of honor, and as judges would always act as such, yet if this be so and always was so, *how is it that so many wars have taken place between nations that refused all diplomatic settlement, including arbitration?*

Not that the proposition to have a court of lawyers is at all a bad one. On the contrary, it is a decided step forward. But it is a suggestion which needs development.

At present it serves admirably to introduce what we mean by

PALESTINE THE SOLUTION OF WAR.

It is true that arbitration is the only becoming solution of the problem how to abolish war.

But there must be some established arbitrative power to which disputing nations can appeal.

1. It must be above suspicion.

2. It must be removed from any chance of being biased by any possible political considerations.

3. It must have a moral, and if need be, a physical force behind it to enforce its decisions.

There is but one arbitrative power which can fulfil all these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

requirements, and we offer it because it comes from that book which has already given mankind so many practical ideals—the Bible.

But it involves the restoration of Palestine to the Hebrew nation. The mere suggestion of this opens a vista of practical results of tremendous importance, if we will only pause to merely glance at them. For it means :

(*a*) The solution of the vexed Eastern question, the political rivalries and jealousies in the East. These affect all the powers, for England cannot afford to have another power on the highway between her and her Indian and Australian empires. France chafes already at England in Egypt. Austria and Italy have Mediterranean interests which may not be overshadowed ; and Russia considers she is bound by political and religious motives to have Palestine herself.

(*b*) The solution of religious rivalries and jealousies which affect the three great religious worlds of Catholic, Protestant, and Greek Church. None can afford to have the other supreme in the land whose very dust is so sacred to all.

(*c*) The erection of the Hebrew nation by the powers into a neutral state, its boundaries prescribed by the Bible limitation (Gen. xv. 18–21 ; Deut. xi. 24), so that it could not possibly have any territorial ambition beyond them, nor could it ever be exposed to political intrigue for its own aggrandizement.

(*d*) The opening up of a vast commerce, for which the Hebrews are peculiarly qualified by commercial genius, and for which they are prepared by their commercial establishments in all countries, which would be maintained and continued. (See Isa. lxi. 9.) In this commerce all nations would advantageously participate. For Palestine, geographically, is the natural converging point of the trade routes between two continents, Europe and Africa on one side, and two continents, Asia and Australia, on the other. Tyre, Sidon, Elath, Ezion-Geber, Beyrout, Haifa, and Acre among her ports would speedily become the London, Marseilles, New York, or Hamburg of the East. And while to them the ships of the world would "fly as a cloud and as doves to their windows" (Isa. lx. 8), the hum of industry's pauseless fingers would be the psalm of life of myriads in a land once a granary of the world, the successors of the myriads of whose existence the countless ruins of to-day are the dumb but heart-moving witnesses.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*e*) It would mean the solution of the so-called Jewish question, whether it is Russian Pan-slav policy or Franco-German anti-semitism which propounds it. And the Hebrew nation of to-day, by its eminence in finance, letters, science, and trade, deserves attention for reasons which need not here be noted.

(*f*) And it would mean the fulfilment of two Bible ideals of vital importance to humanity. The one is "a house of prayer for all nations" (Isa. lvi. 7). This would be erected in the same broad spirit which made King Solomon pray when he dedicated his temple: "And also the stranger who is not of Thy people Israel, and cometh from a far-off land, because of Thy Name, when they hear of Thy great Name and Thy strong hand and Thine outstretched arm, and he come and pray to this temple, O do Thou hear in Heaven the place of Thy dwelling and *do all that the stranger crieth to Thee for!*" (I. Kings viii. 41 *seq.*) This would mean the quickening of the idea of the Brotherhood of Man, recognizing the Father of all of us.

And the other ideal would be the institution of a world's court of arbitration, when "out of Zion shall go forth law, and He will judge between the nations and reprove many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation will not lift up sword against nation, neither will they learn war any more." (Isa. ii. 3–4; Micah iv. 2 and 3.)

If the codification of international law by the chief jurists of the world is the first step towards the solution of war and the education of public opinion to the cost, the injustice, the horror, and the shame of war is the second, this creation of an international court of arbitration is the final step and the guarantee of peace and its blessings. It would be based upon such codification, its force would rest secure in public opinion. The administration of international law would be intrusted to the said court, each member of which would be a graduate in international law, high in rank among the learned of the Hebrew nation, esteemed as an authority on the polity of nations by the world at large and known to be in life *sans peur et sans reproche*. We say Hebrews, because the Hebrew nation alone has and can have no political interests outside its Bible boundaries to bias its decision. Arbitration, impartial and honorable, will thus be rendered by a court of a nation whose very existence will depend upon impartiality;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose past history will cry to it to judge righteously and fearlessly. Its environment will be the Temple, dedicated to the Father of all; and over its members will be the halo of religion.

That it would take years to codify international law and educate public opinion against war, yes. But what are a few years in view of the advantages to be ultimately gained? And it may be years before the final step can be taken, the restoration of Palestine to the Hebrews, for this is not to be until God's own time (Isa. lx. 22). The colonies, settled and settling there, seem but preparatory for their reception. But once a *fait accompli*, a general disarmament could then be safely expected and safely effected.

What if a nation should refuse to abide by the law going forth from Zion? It is a very remote contingency. The very treaty erecting Palestine into a neutral state, and clothing its court of international arbitration with its functions, would provide for just such a contingency. The moral force of the educated public opinion would speedily bring a recalcitrant nation to its senses. How could it withstand a threatened ostracism, or a combination of physical force or other penalties? But the time will come, it must come, when nations "will not learn war any more" and when humanity's watchwords at last will be Right and Reason instead of Might and Treason.

Before our eyes rises a picture of the nations restoring the Hebrews "as an offering," as the prophet phrases it (Isa. lxvi. 20): shall we say as "an amendment offering" for the injustice of lead-footed centuries? We dream of that martyr-nation of history, "despised and rejected," as that very prophet foretold, "wounded through others' transgressions, bruised through others' iniquities," at last rightly, justly, lovingly dealt with!

But with the picture and the dream, and far surpassing both in beauty, we behold a vision of peace and goodwill at last on earth —or as the psalmist grandly words it: "Love and truth meeting, righteousness and peace embracing, truth springing forth from earth, and charity looking down from heaven" (Ps. lxxxv.).

O that some statesman would crown his life by reaching out to turn war with its cost, curse, and crime, into a realization of the ideal of prophet and psalmist!

H. Pereira Mendes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE YACHT AS A NAVAL AUXILIARY.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM McADOO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE true yachtsman is a genuine sailor in whose breast is that strong, enduring love of the sea that voluntarily braves its dangers and shrinks not from its possible privations and discomforts. His is the eye quick to catch the lines of beauty, the grace of form, and the elements of strength and utility in all manner of craft that go down to the sea. If he is worthy of this royal sport, his soul has heard and responded to the voice of nature, and to him the olden gods of wind and wave are no longer myths but eternal verities, speaking to him of mysteries and secrets that the profane heart cannot understand. Man first built vessels of necessity and utility, then ships of war, and lastly those for pleasure, and the last is first cousin to the second, and the country which produces them in numbers has got the naval spirit. The modern well-conditioned yacht assimilates her life as nearly as possible to that of the war ship in her order, discipline, etiquette, and even outward emblems and signs, and as a general rule all yachtsmen are the warmest and closest friends of the naval establishment. They have for many years been the most earnest advocates of a naval reserve, and are to-day, to a large extent, the stimulus that helps forward the existing naval militia.

The growth of yachting in the United States in the last twenty years, marvellous as it has been, is but one of the many signs of the turning of our people again to the sea, and the re-establishment of our merchant marine in the proud position it held in the days of the famous clipper ships. At heart we are a maritime people, and, possessing, as we do, a long stretch of coast, enclosing broad arms of the sea, it is not surprising that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yachting is growing in popularity. No other country affords such broad expanses of sheltered waters as Massachusetts Bay, Long Island Sound, the Chesapeake, the sounds of the Carolinas, Mobile Bay, Santa Barbara Channel, San Francisco Bay, Puget Sound, and the great and lesser lakes, with their numerous tributaries and adjacent harbors.

On January 1st of this year there were ninety regular organized yacht clubs and four auxiliary associations in the United States. The yachts are owned either by clubs, by two or three owners associated together, or by individuals who can afford to own one or more on their own account. There are about two thousand two hundred and fifty of this last named class in this country, and quite a number of them own two or three each. In all the remainder of this hemisphere there are but seven yacht clubs all told, three in Canada, and one each in Nova Scotia, Cuba, Jamaica, and the Argentine Republic. The state of New York heads the list with thirty-two clubs; Massachusetts has nineteen; New Jersey, ten; Connecticut, seven; California and Rhode Island, three each; Maine, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Florida, two each; North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama and Louisiana, one each; and there are ten clubs along the Lake region on our northern boundary, two of which are included in the thirty-two credited above to New York. Of the clubs enumerated as to States, at least forty are located in New York harbor, Long Island Sound, and their adjacent waters. The interior waterway communication along our coast line, so well illustrated in the recent trip of the torpedo boat "Cushing," gives additional impetus to yachting through the enormous water course it is now possible to traverse in even the smallest class of yachts with perfect safety, and to the rivalry thus offered through visiting yachts from various sections of the coast.

What is or may be, from a naval standpoint, the value of all this individual and organized effort?

There are two elements to be considered: First, the men; and second, the yachts themselves. Both are now of value to the country, the yachts in the lesser degree than the trained yachtsmen, but both may be made of greater value by a proper appreciation of their possibilities. The men, through their experience in handling yachts under all conditions of sea and weather, through their acquired knowledge of the waters in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they cruise, and through their general nautical training, offer a magnificent field for the formation of State naval militia organizations and ultimately for a national naval reserve. And while few yachts are so constructed as to be of much use in time of war, yet the possibilities are such that, by mutual agreement between yacht owners and the government when the plans are under consideration, they may be constructed to answer the double purpose of yachts in time of peace and naval auxiliaries in time of war.

The fostering of a reserve of men and ships, supplemental to the regular forces, is only second in importance to the creation of a navy itself. Maritime power goes hand in hand with naval power, for a commercial marine can only be built up and maintained coincidently with the creation of an efficient navy. Unquestionably the building of war ships has contributed largely to the renewal of our ship building industries, and the study of ship construction for war purposes has served the double purpose of improving the details, and of raising the standard of the tests and requirements, of ship building in general. In the especial construction of vessels such as the "St. Paul" and "St. Louis" as naval auxiliaries, we note the gradual approach of types of ships in which the commercial and naval ideas are blended. A similar approach in type of steam yachts and the smaller auxiliaries of the navy, is sure to come later.

It takes longer to make seamen, however, than to make ships. That our present naval *personnel* is inadequate, even for peace conditions, is shown by the increase on July 1st of this year of the complement of men in our navy by 1,000, simply because we have recently added a few new ships to the navy, yet the total force at present is only 10,000 men. At the breaking out of the Civil War the complement had been fixed at 7,600. By July, 1863, there were 34,000 in the service, and when the war closed there were 51,500 enrolled in the navy. Our merchant marine, then glorious in its extent, furnished most of these; but where shall we look for our reserve now?

At the end of the war there were 7,600 officers in the navy, and 671 ships in commission. Of the officers, but one-seventh were regulars. Where shall we get others now? Of the ships, but 277 were built by the government. Where shall we get our auxiliaries now? Our merchant marine is small, and modern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naval requirements are different, the naval profession being so complex; where, therefore, are we to get our reserve of men and ships? They can no longer be picked up under the spur of necessity. It is now a question of systematic, steady preparation and organization in time of peace.

The naval militia organizations, as bred and created largely in a yachting atmosphere and now existing in thirteen States, with a present complement of 226 officers and 2,706 men, are the first auxiliaries to be considered. The existing naval militia is primarily a State organization, dependent largely upon local and State support, and enrolled as part of the National Guard. It is not a true naval reserve which should owe allegiance only to the general government and be subject solely to the naval regulations governing the general service. While subject, however, to State control, the naval militia is kept in constant touch with the regular establishment by receiving, for arms and equipments, in each State, a portion of the $25,000 annually appropriated for its encouragement by Congress, and distributed by the Department under such rules as are deemed wisest and best for the object to be accomplished. Congress has also authorized by law the loan of unused ships and other property to States having organized and equipped naval militia. The ships so loaned are those out of commission and unsuited for regular naval service. The greatest difficulty now encountered is to find a sufficient number of such vessels to meet the demand. The discarded wooden ships of the old navy make most excellent inshore armories for these organizations, but, unfortunately, these have nearly all been disposed of by sale or otherwise. Following the spirit, as well as the letter of the law, the Department has endeavored to give to these organizations every possible encouragement, keeping them in touch with the navy by advice on all professional subjects, inspection by officers whenever desired, issuing printed documents for their instruction, opening up to them all sources of professional information, and giving them each summer an opportunity for a short cruise on some of the ships in the regular service, where, in addition to being taught somewhat of the manifold duties of a man-of-warsman, they are enabled to practise firing the great guns at a target from the moving ship. They are also allowed to draw at first cost arms and equipments from the portion of the national allowance allotted to their State. As a result, in some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the States, the naval militia is the best armed military body in the State, having rapid fire guns of the very latest pattern, magazine rifles, and good serviceable navy revolvers. All this, however, would be of little avail without intelligent, persistent, and enthusiastic individual effort and the support of the State to whose forces they belong. It is but right that it should be said here that some of the States have been most liberal and progressive in encouraging and aiding this new arm of defense. In the States where the organization is best and most efficient these results have been secured by great labor, patience, and tact. There were and are sources of opposition calling forth determination and sound judgment.

What is the future of the naval militia? Will it grow into a true naval reserve under national auspices, such for instance as that possessed by England? In time of war, where will be its most practicable field? Manning sea coast batteries, inner line coast defense ships, or furnishing crews to the regular sea-going fighting vessels? As to all this, the best officers in the service differ; and indeed at this moment, the possibilities of the organization are so great and its field so wide that no one can give categorical replies to these queries. That it is a good organization for the country scarcely any one will deny. It is now largely in its formative period, and when wisely led, is following the line of least resistance in search of its best field of usefulness as a part of the national defense of the coast and on the high seas. It is everywhere doing good, hard, honest, preparatory work, often under very discouraging circumstances; is full of naval enthusiasm; and willing to make sacrifices and undergo hardships. As a purely local organization in the large cities having navigable water front, it will, in case of need, be found a most efficient military body doing work which could not be done, at least so well, by the purely land forces. Its rapid growth in many States without any concerted movement or official encouragement is especially suggestive of the active and unselfish spirit of patriotism to be found in our country.

The sea-going yachts give to yachtsmen the very best training in seamanship and navigation, but it is to the steam yacht in particular that we must look for the auxiliary vessel for naval purposes in time of war. Three types of these are now being developed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1st. The large, full-powered steam yachts like the "Atlanta," "Corsair," "Conqueror," "Columbia," "Electra," "Eleanor," "Margarita," "May," "Namouna," "Nourmahal," "Oneida," "Peerless," "Sagamore," "Sapphire," "Utowana," and "Valiant."

2d. The auxiliary type with moderate steam and sail power, as illustrated by the "Intrepid" and "Wild Duck."

3d. The high speed boats for sheltered waters and comparatively short runs, like the "Now Then," "Say When," "Helvetia," "Norwood" and a host of others.

The first and third classes might be utilized as torpedo boats by considerable alterations in the direction of removing unnecessary weights and strengthening the decks, but the types in the future, by conforming in the plans to one or two necessary conditions, might be made to answer all the purposes of the owner in time of peace and of the government in time of war. Just how this agreement would be arrived at between the owner and the government is a question depending largely upon the patriotic impulses of the owners and upon the liberality of the government in the way of guarantees. For instance, the government might furnish inspectors to superintend the building; provide all the supports, racks, bulkheads, fittings and outfits of a military character; have the yachts regularly inspected as to hull, fittings and machinery and the competence of the master and engineers; and finally, enroll them in a naval reserve, with the right to fly a special flag and to uniform their officers and crew in conformity therewith.

In return, the government should have the right to charter or purchase them in time of war, and, by special agreement, to use them for a few days each year for drill or training purposes at a time when the owners would need them least. Granting that this system would not spoil a yacht in any way for the purposes for which the owner built her, and that the cost to the government, outside of the actual inspection and the war materials, should be more or less nominal and should in no circumstances include anything in the nature of a bonus, it would seem that the advantages on both sides might be sufficient to warrant a trial of the system. There are, and probably always will be, numerous Whitehead and Howell torpedo oufits stored at the Torpedo Station, at Newport, R. I., and the process of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fitting out or converting a yacht would only occupy a few days.

There are three methods of installing the tubes from which the torpedoes are fired: 1st, over all; 2d, between decks; and 3d, below the water line. The last named is very expensive and need not be considered. It is the height of the upper deck above the water that determines which of the other two is used. Eleven feet is considered the limit at which a torpedo may be launched. If the upper deck is higher than this, the installation must be between decks. This necessitates extra weights, as the shutter for the tube and the ball joint for training a beam are required. The question of weights is most important.

Whitehead torpedoes weigh about 850 pounds each, and at least two are carried for each tube. Except in time of war or during periods of drill, the torpedoes would not be carried on board. The number of tubes would depend on the size of the yacht. The lower deck tubes, mounts, deck circles, etc., weigh about 2,800 pounds, and the upper deck fittings, complete, about 2,100 pounds. Each yacht would require a Bliss air compressor, with separator and accessories, weighing about 475 pounds.

The Howell torpedo weighs about 514 pounds. Weights are practically the same for the mounts, but no air compressor is needed. A boiler pressure of 80 pounds of steam is, however, required to operate the fly-wheel.

As regards the weight of battery, any type of one-pounder rapid-fire gun will weigh with mounts from 225 to 275 pounds, and the boxes of ammunition about 122 pounds each.

Within the limits of this article it has been impossible to speak of the great mass of small steam and sailing craft which are sailed and managed by their owners, who are in large part young men and boys strongly imbued with a love of things nautical and who, in case of necessity, being highly intelligent, more or less skilled in the arts of the sailor, and deeply patriotic, could be relied on as a most excellent and efficient force for naval defensive operations.

The eager and enthusiastic yachting spirit now abroad in our land bodes well, not only for the navy, but for the merchant marine, to see a healthy revival of which is the ardent hope of all who love the Republic.

WILLIAM MCADOO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT TO AVOID IN CYCLING.

BY SIR BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON, M. D., F. R. S.

IT HAS been my lot for so long a series of years to be concerned in the art and practice of cycling that the various effects of it, good and bad, have become with me a matter of common observation. I feel as conversant with the details as if they formed a part of my professional life, and this fact enables me to speak with a certain degree of confidence, which is strengthened by the circumstance that I have no kind of prejudices bearing upon the subject. Cycling came before me in the first place in what may be called an accidental manner. I had been presiding at a sanitary congress held at Leamington, in the county of Warwick; the first held in England in which matters relating to health alone were introduced. Connected with this congress was a large sanitary exhibition; and amongst the exhibits there were a few bicycles and one of the first machines manufactured in this country in the shape of a tricycle. This tricycle was worked by what was called lever movement; the pedal, now so universal, not having been then applied to tricycles. The late Sir Edwin Chadwick, one of the Vice-Presidents of the congress, who, though far advanced in life, was as alert as a schoolboy on all inventions that presented novelty and that affected the health of the body, had his attention called to this new machine. Greatly struck by it and by the good work that could be done upon it, he promised to bring me next day to see it in action, and so, accompanied by a large number of the council of the congress, I went with him and had the whole thing explained to me by the exhibitor. Seeing that movement upon it was comparatively simple, I had the machine brought out to an asphalt passage leading to the main road, and straightway mounted it. The attendants were prompt in their efforts to prevent my sustaining injury from the venture. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all idea of danger rapidly disappeared, and I very soon ran away from my protectors, reached the main road, which lay at a right angle from the asphalt passage, proceeded a good half mile on my own account, and returned in triumph, to the great delight of the lookers-on. From that day until now I have been a cyclist. I very soon had a machine of my own, choosing what was called a "Rob Roy," in which the levers were replaced by pedals, a very nice instrument, which had, however, the misfortune of being what is called a "single-driver"; that is to say, progression upon it was by the work of one wheel. Then followed the "Salvo," in which machine the late Mr. Starley, of Coventry, got over the difficulty of the single wheel by the compensation process, and turned out a really admirable instrument, one of which kind I rode for several years with great comfort and safety, and which, in fact, I still retain. It was a very heavy machine, weighing about 120 pounds. The wheels were unnecessarily high and the gearing was low, but, nevertheless, I got on with it, climbing the hills with great ease, and, as the brake was perfect, went down hills with a rapidity and safety that could not easily be excelled. Later on I followed the various improvements of machines using two trackers.

My experience has all been, personally, with the tricycle, but my observation has extended also to bicycles through the experiences of those who have been my companions, for very soon I found companionship in cycling more than in any other pastime, and it is from such experiences, together with my own, that I write what is subjoined.

From the first my impressions have been always in favor of cycling, and, to some extent, the expression of that favor on certain public occasions has, I think, helped to popularize the movement. I believe the exercise has been of the greatest service to large numbers of people. It has made them use their limbs; it it has called out good mental qualities, and it has taken away from close rooms, courts and streets, hundreds of thousands of persons who would otherwise never have had the opportunity of getting into the fresh air and seeing the verdant fields and woods, the lakes and rivers, and the splendid scenery that adorn our land. This is all in favor of the cycle, the bicycle or tricycle, but I have yet more to say in the same direction. I am bound to indicate from direct observation that cycling has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

useful in the cure of some diseases and that it is always carried on with advantage, even when there is a marked disease. I have seen it do a great deal of good to persons suffering from fatty disease of the heart, from gout, from dyspepsia, from varicose veins, from melancholia, from failure due to age, from some forms of heart disease, from intermittent pulse and palpitation, and distinctly from anemia. Moreover, I have known persons who could not have been expected to ride without danger get on extremely well in their riding, and have often, with due precautions, given permission to ride even to some patients to whom five and twenty years ago I should have forbidden every kind of exercise. These truths I have proclaimed publicly without any hesitation, and sometimes to the wonder of friends who still held views which I had been compelled to discard.

But now it is my duty to speak on the other side and to report such experience as yields evidence of dangers from cycling. I shall speak on this point as explicitly as is necessary.

There are dangers from cycling. The first is the danger of teaching the practice to subjects who are too young. Properly, cycling should not be carried on with any ardor while the body is undergoing its development—while the skeleton, that is to say, is as yet imperfectly developed. The skeleton is not completely matured until twenty-one years of life have been given to it. The cartilaginous structures have to be transformed into true osseous structures before the body can be said to be naturally perfected. If it be pressed into too rapid exercise while it is undergoing its growth it is the easiest thing in the world to make the growth premature, or even to cause a deformity. The spinal column is particularly apt to be injured by too early riding, and the exquisite curve of the spinal column, which gives to that column when it is natural such easy and graceful attitudes for standing erect, stooping, and bending, is too often distorted by its rigidity or want of resiliency. When that is the case the limbs share in the injury. They do not properly support the trunk of the body, and pedestrian exercise, thereupon, becomes clumsy, irregular, and ungraceful. We see these errors particularly well marked in the young, now that the cross-bar system of the cycle has come so generally into use. The tendency in riding is for the body to bend forward so as to bring itself almost into the curve of the front wheel, and in this position many riders hold themselves for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours, and the spine more or less permanently assumes the bent position. In plain words, the column becomes distorted, and through the whole life affects the movements of the body.

There are further injuries done to the youth, male or female, through other organs of the body and especially through the heart. Dr. Kolb, as well as myself, has found that it is the heart which is principally exercised during cycling. So soon as brisk cycling has commenced the motions of the heart begin to increase. In this respect cycling differs from many other exercises. Rowing tells most on the breathing organs; dumb-bells and other exercises where the muscles are moved without progression of the body, tell most on the muscles; whilst in climbing and long pedestrian feats it is the nervous system that is most given to suffer. There is not a cycle rider of any age in whom the heart is not influenced so as to do more work, and although in skilled cyclists and trained cyclists a certain balance is set up which equalizes the motion, such riders are not exempt from danger. I have known the beats of the heart to rise from 80 to 200 in the minute, in the first exercise of riding, an increase which, for the time, more than doubles the amount of work done—a very serious fact when we remember that the extreme natural motion of the heart allows it to perform a task equal to raising not less than 122 foot-tons in the course of 24 hours, that is to say, over 5 foot-tons an hour. In the young we may apply the same argument to the heart as we have done to the skeleton; the heart is undergoing its development, and it is an organ which cannot without danger be whipped on beyond its natural pace. What occurs with it under such circumstances is that it grows larger than it ought to grow, that it works out of harmony with the rest of the body, and is then most easily agitated by influences and impressions acting upon it through the mind. I have many times seen this truth illustrated too plainly, and I doubt whether in the young, after extreme exercise, such as that which arises from a prolonged race, the heart ever comes down to its natural beat for a period of less than three days devoted to repose.

In the young, excessive riding affects unfavorably the muscles of the body generally, as well as the heart, which is itself a muscle. Properly, the muscles go through stages of development just as the skeleton does, and to attain a truly good muscular form all the great groups of muscles ought to be evenly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and systematically exercised. But cycling does not do that; it develops one set of muscles at the expense of the other. It does not develop the chest muscles properly; it does not develop the arm muscles properly; it does not develop the abdominal muscles properly; it does not essentially develop the muscles of the back; but it does develop the muscles of the lower limbs, and that out of proportion to all the rest. I have a picture in my mind's eye at this moment of a youth who, when stripped, was actually deformed by the disproportionate size of the muscles of the calf of the leg, and of the forepart of the thigh—an effect which unbalanced the body as a whole, and greatly impaired it for good healthy action.

Lastly, in the young, cycling often tells unfavorably on the nervous function. The brain and nervous system, like skeleton and muscle, have to be slowly nurtured up to maturity, and if they be called upon to do too much while they are in the immature state, if the senses of sight and hearing and touch have to be too much exercised, even though by such exercise danger from collisions may be skilfully averted, perhaps to the admiration of lookers-on, there is a tax put upon those organs which makes them prematurely old and unfitted for the more delicate tasks that have afterwards to be performed.

There are two classes of dangers arising out of overstrain in cycling: the first may be called the extreme, the second the moderate danger. I will take the extreme first. This is shown in those remarkable athletes who enter into competitions such as have never before been dreamed of in the history of the world. The results of such competitions have as yet excited comparatively little notice among men who are specially skilled in estimating their importance, but they convey the strangest intelligence as to the physical capabilities of man. They show that men have been found able to travel, by virtue of their own bodily energy, 400 miles at one effort. They show also that men can be trained to perform this effort without sleep, and that the body can be kept using itself up, as it were, for the long period of 40 hours. Sleep, which the poet tells us "knits up the ravelled sleeve of care, is the balm of hurt minds, and chief nourisher in Life's feast," sleep, which is the very harbinger of health, is here set aside, with the result of a victory absolutely purposeless, at the expense of the whole body. There has not been, as far as I can ascertain, a single

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

example of a feat of this kind being accomplished without direct and immediate sign of injury. Finally, when the labor is done there is the period of recovery which lasts for many hours, and is in itself an ordeal which the strongest nature ought never to be subjected to. The result is that these victims of extreme competition last but few years in the ordinary condition of health and strength.

In this criticism is included a summary of the objection which has to be made to record breaking, a kind of absurd effort, the end of which it is very difficult to foresee, for, unfortunately, it may be urged with apparent plausibility that it is good as practice. The enthusiastic cyclists tell us that it is through record breaking that all the great advances have been made. Record breaking, they say, depends upon improvements which take place, not simply in the work of the riders or in those who compete, but also in the development of the machine itself. It has been found, for example, that the lightening of the machine, the reduction of its weight down even to twenty or thirty pounds, has been one of the great achievements. A man put more work originally into a machine weighing, say one hundred and twenty pounds, while doing ten or fifteen miles an hour, than is now put forth on a light machine doing over twenty miles an hour. There is a great deal of truth in this statement, and I fully admit that the record breakers have done service in making cycling, as an art, a remarkable exhibition of human skill and endurance. I have suggested for many years past that the end of these efforts will be a transition to the domain of flight, and that a good flying machine will ultimately come out of the cycle. The cycle, in fact, will develop into the flying machine through the intervention of wings, which will be workable by the power of the individual alone or aided by some very light motor. It is, therefore, with great reluctance, that I protest against the overstrain which I have seen. It is a kind of self-martyrdom to which we may conscientiously give admiration and support.

The second effect of overstrain is rather a forced than a voluntary martyrdom. Those who suffer from it are mostly young persons, often mere boys, who are made to ply the machine, probably heavily loaded, in commercial duties and business. It is astonishing in this metropolis of London what an amount of work a youth can be trained to do. He can really do the work of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horse, owing to the quantity and weight of goods he can distribute, and the rapidity with which he can get through his task. There is a little ambition about it also, for the young people often like the exercise, and are proud of showing off their skill and energy, while their employers, apprehending no evil from it, let them do as much as ever they can. The result is a greatly expedited circulation in these young laborers and an extreme tension of the heart and arteries, these organs being as yet immature and easily over-expanded under undue pressure. The effects are not immediate, but they lead to enlargement or hypertrophy of the heart and to those derangements of the blood vessels which follow upon dilatation of the arterial circuit. Afterwards, when the maturity is completed and the organs of the body cease to develop, there is a disproportion between the vascular system and the other parts of the body, which means general irregularity of function; a powerful left heart pulsating into a feeble body, and a powerful right heart pulsating into the lungs. The effect must, of necessity, be injurious, and the fact is too well demonstrated in practice. I have seen this enlargement and over-action in so many instances I am convinced that when it is more correctly and widely understood it will be recognized that cycling is one of the causes of "disease from occupation," and that some public steps will have to be taken to limit the danger. But the danger is not always connected with occupation. Many well to do young persons of both sexes, by the enthusiasm and competitive work they throw into the exercise, become affected in a similar manner, and have to be restrained, when that is possible, from too great an indulgence in the pursuit.

In noticing these evils I have proceeded at once to the most important central evil, that which applies to the heart and circulation from overstrain. But there are other phenomena I must not let pass. There is often developed in the cyclist a general vibratory condition of the body which is mischievous and is shown in various acts of movement and thought. There are certain unconscious or semi-unconscious movements of the body which become sensible to the subject himself at particular moments when great steadiness is called for, as, for instance, when sitting for a photograph. There is also shown an over desire for rapidity of motion, as if it were necessary at every moment to overcome time and curtail distance by labor of an extreme degree. Lastly, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is developed a kind of intoxication of movement which grows on the mind by what it feeds on and keeps the heart under the impression that it is always requiring the stimulation of the exercise. These sensations, it will be said, are entirely "nervous," and under a correct interpretation of the word I perfectly admit that they are so. It is improper, at the same time, to consider that a persistent sensation, or series of sensations, should be disregarded altogether because they are what is called "nervous." A repetition of nervous phenomena produces, in a short time, a habit that is strengthened by craving or desire, like the desire for alcohol and other stimulants when the need is felt of whipping the heart into a greater state of activity. I have long been of opinion that all cravings and impulses, indeed, spring from the heart as from their centre or magazine, and not from an independent brain; as if, in short, the heart were the mind centre of motive desire and action.

There are some further symptoms observable in many developed men and women who indulge in cycling and which, though they may be minor in degree, should not be neglected. In all long tours carried out by cyclists we meet with these minor developments and I candidly confess that, prudent as I have been in my excursions, I have experienced the symptoms myself. You are out on a bright day skimming along the roads, with everything in favor of the exercise. You have gained your "wind," that is to say, your breathing and circulation are going together in harmony; you have lost the sensation of strain in the front muscles of the thigh; your spirits are exhilarated as you pass along; you do not indulge in spurts but keep steadily at your work, and as the day begins to close you are going so merrily that you actually regret that the journey has come to an end. You dismount for the night: you take, perhaps, a fair supper; you luxuriate in a bath, and you go to bed. But when you get into bed a most provoking thing occurs; you do not sleep; you are kept awake by a constant restlessness of the muscles. The muscles of the lower limbs will not be quiet. They start you up in twitches and if you look at the muscles, especially the muscles in the calves of the legs, you see that they are in motion although you may not feel them. I remember an instance in which the observance of these muscular twitchings created actual alarm to the rider, and I myself counted no less than sixty of them within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the minute. They are muscular motions arising from an over-irritable condition excited by the riding. They may extend even to the muscles of the thighs and they always produce a restless night. Toward the morning the muscles become more composed and a heavy sleep follows, with a weary waking as if the body were as tired on rising as it was on going to bed. Presently, when the muscles are again exercised, the weariness passes away and a repetition of the cycling effort actually, after a time, appears to bring more relief, so that you cycle with the greatest freedom. The continued exercise is, however, no real cure; the phenomena are repeated, and cycling becomes at last a very wearisome pursuit. I have known actual breakdowns from this distressing cause, and I warn all cyclists, but especially those who have attained middle age, to moderate their enthusiasm whenever they find that the motion of cycling long continued produces muscular restlessness and impaired sleep.

The question has often been put to me whether dangers not as yet referred to are induced or increased by the efforts of cycling. Does hernia, or rupture, occur through cycling? I can say fairly I have never known it. Does enlargement of the veins increase through cycling? I can say fairly I have never known it; on the contrary I have, I think, seen a reduction of venous enlargement under the exercise. Does congestion of the brain ever occur, with giddiness or other symptoms referable to the head? I confess I have never known it, and I do not recall an example in which owing to symptoms immediately induced any rider has felt it necessary to dismount from the machine. But there are two things which I have witnessed and which I would like finally to record.

I have known persons of lymphatic and gouty tendency who have taken to cycling and have felt at first great good from it. They have become warm advocates of the pastime and, indulging in it extremely, have suffered from their extreme devotion to it. I have observed that certain of these have become depressed, have lost tone, and have been obliged, peremptorily, to give up the sport they were so fond of. I have also known amongst the gouty a peculiar kind of gout induced by the exercise, and thereupon a dislike to it—a result which is rather unfortunate, as well as unnecessary, because the injury has been brought about by overdoing the thing, and by turning what would be useful into an injurious practice. In conclusion, though, as I have said, severe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

head symptoms from cycling are unusual, it is within the range of my experience to have known general injury in nervous subjects brought on by a too great stress of observation in riding, such as is induced by the fear of collision in crowded thoroughfares, too rapid a motion in descending hills, or too severe a trial in overcoming obstacles that caused the danger of a fall. I have even known young people, not bad riders, injured by too great trespass on nervous power, and I certainly would advise all timid riders to avoid tempting Providence too far in trying to show off their ability as against their better trained and cooler companions.

BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TURNING OF THE TIDE.

BY WORTHINGTON C. FORD, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF STATISTICS AT WASHINGTON.

INCREASED imports of merchandise, decreased exports of domestic products; less gold imported, and more exported; a smaller import and export of silver; a larger tonnage movement, and a diminished immigration—such are the main features of the trade and navigation of the United States in the fiscal year 1895, just closed, compared with the results of the fiscal year 1894. This is not on its face a very encouraging showing; but it represents far more than the bare statement shows. In June, 1894, the situation had been one of extreme depression and financial anxiety for more than a year. The Treasury gold was going out at the rate of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars a day, and was leaving the country in even larger amounts. The banks were proffering "loans" of gold to stop a leak which seemed unending. The Treasury had been once replenished, and yet the reserve stood at a point lower than had been known since the resumption of specie payments. Enterprise was paralyzed under the strain, and the gloomiest predictions found ready endorsement in conservative circles. Small "armies" of paupers roving the country were pointed to as an example of what the future would reproduce on a large and dangerous scale. In June, 1895, the financial aspect had been improved, but only by passing through a crisis the like of which had not been experienced since 1873, perhaps not since Black Friday. The industrial prospects had also brightened, and, last of all, trade rises in volume under the stimulus of manufacturing demands, wider markets, and better prices. 1894 will be known as a panic year; 1895 will mark the turning of the tide from depression toward prosperity, absolute as well as comparative. The recovery has been slow, and at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same time rapid. There were evidences of better things a year ago; but six long weary years were needed to recover from the consequences of 1873. To the approaching change the foreign commerce of the country bears witness.

The imports of merchandise for the twelve months ending June 30, 1895, were $731,960,319; those for the preceding year were $654,994,622. There was an increase of $76,965,697, or 11.7 per cent. This increased import lay entirely in the dutiable merchandise; $368,729,392 in 1895, and $275,199,086 in 1894. The imports of merchandise free of duty differed in the two years by about $16,000,000. The transfer of sugar from the free to the dutiable side in great part accounts for this difference; but the certainty of duties in 1895 has encouraged imports, while the uncertainty in 1894 was an effectual discouragement. In 1894 the exports of domestic merchandise were valued at $869,204,937; in 1895, $793,553,018. The loss on domestic exports was $75,651,919, or nearly the same amount as was gained in the imports. Including exports of foreign merchandise, the total trade of 1895 was $1,539,653,580, or $8,000,000 less than the total commerce of 1894. The very large excess of exports over imports which was shown at the end of 1894, $237,145,950, was not repeated, for the excess of exports in 1895 was only $75,732,942. It was remarkable that the trade conditions of 1894 did not lead to imports of gold in settlement of the apparent balance in favor of this country; and it is hardly likely that the smaller exports of 1895 can be an important factor in determining the commercial movement of gold against the very much larger influence exerted by the transfer of American securities.

Less food was imported in 1895 than in 1894, more raw materials for domestic industries, more partly manufactured articles, and more manufactures for consumption. Allowing for the disturbance due to the tariff contest, this showing may be taken as evidence of a rising industrial movement, and no more general index of economic condition can be found.

The movement of gold has been remarkable. The exports for the twelve months were $66,131,183, and were made in the first seven months—July to February. The imports were $35,120,331, making a net export of $31,000,000. This loss of gold would have been much greater had it not been for the operations of the syndicate. In the face of high rates of exchange and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a natural tendency for gold to leave the country in the spring and summer months, little gold has been sent abroad, the Treasury has maintained the reserve, and, now that the crops will come forward, the danger of a recurrence of a rush for gold is believed to be reduced to a minimum.

The time was when the farmers of the United States were the great feeders of grain and suppliers of fine cotton of the world. Other peoples have developed in competing capacity in grain and meats, and at no time has their ability been so great as at present. It was Russia and British India that were feared as competitors; it is now the Argentine Republic, which appears to have an almost unlimited power to grow and export wheat in defiance of any competition. The agrarian policies of European nations have also militated against American breadstuffs and provisions, as well by encouraging home production as by discouraging, even prohibiting, imports from the United States. No class of articles has been so materially influenced by the fall in prices. As early as 1885 wheat had fallen below the dollar mark, and only in 1892 did it rise above it. But the export price of 1894, 67 cents, was unusual, and the still lower average of 1895, 57 cents, was demoralizing. Corn, in which no competition is felt, was steadier in price, but the other breadstuffs were lower, and the result in the aggregate is startling. The value of the breadstuffs exported in 1895 was about $115,000,000; and to find so low a figure one must go back to 1877. A comparison of quantities will show how fallacious is such a test.

	1877.		1895.	
Barley	1,186,129	bush.	1,556,715	bush.
Corn	70,861,000	"	25,507,753	"
Oats	2,854,128	"	540,975	"
Rye	2,189,322	"	8,879	"
Wheat	40,325,611	"	75,831,639	"
Flour	3,343,665	bbl.	14,942,647	bbl.

It is wheat and wheat flour that have maintained the export, though due allowance should be made for the deficient crop of 1876, which was smaller than any in the last twenty-one years. Only 20 per cent. of that crop was exported, and 40 per cent. of the crop of 1893 was thus available. The distribution of exports in 1895 was normal, the few large differences being accounted for by good home crops, making a foreign supply unnecessary.

Next in importance stand provisions:—meats and meat products, and dairy products. The total value of exports in 1895

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not very different from that of 1894, seven or eight per cent. less on $145,270,000. All beef and its products show an increase over 1894, tallow alone excepted, which has been influenced by the competition of Australia. Not in twenty years was the quantity of tallow exported so small as in 1895. Bacon, hams and lard have met with greater favor, and the quantity of hams has never been equalled in any previous year, for the export in 1895 will exceed 105,000,000 pounds. It is in Europe this increase has found a market. Dairy products have declined in quantity as well as in value.

The phenomenally low price of raw cotton has tempted heavy purchases from abroad. If the crop year be taken, the exports in the ten months ending June 30, 1895, were 3,427,845,716 pounds, against 2,566,982,921 pounds in the corresponding period of 1894. Nearly 900,000,000 pounds more were sold in 1895 than in the preceding year, and netted $3,400,000 less. The distribution of this increased quantity may be taken as a fair indication of the industrial countries which have felt the approach of better demand for the manufactured goods. England naturally stands first, taking 700,000,000 pounds more in 1895 than in 1894; Germany, France, and Italy will use 450,000,000 pounds in excess of last year; and even greater needs are indicated by the increased exports to Mexico and Canada. One other country, the youngest among nations and the youngest industrial power, will repay careful study if her demand for American cotton may be taken as an indication of growing competence. In the year 1894, less than 5,000,000 pounds were exported to Japan; in the year 1895, the export was more than 11,000,000 pounds. This is the more remarkable as Japan has British India and China as sources of supply, and is known to draw heavily from them. This need for our cotton points to positive development on the best lines of manufacture. It is only five years ago that the United States sent cotton cloth to Japan. Now Japan asks for raw cotton, defeats British Indian competition in yarns, and threatens English cloth with exclusion from the continent of Asia. American cloth, by its low price and good quality, still finds favor in the East. China, through her troubles, has imported less in 1895 than in 1894 by about 17,000,000 yards; but other parts of Asia and Oceanica made good 5,000,000 yards, and in South America the market is increasing, save in the Argentine Republic. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brazil the exports have never been so large, in spite of the abrogation of the reciprocity agreement; while Colombia, which did not enter into the agreement and in consequence had its coffee, hides and skins subjected to a duty on entering the United States, has again reverted to American cottons and surpasses the demand in any previous year. Against these signs of advance must be set a loss of two-thirds, or more than 10,000,000 yards, in the Canadian market—due rather to bad times than to the home industries of that colony.

American cotton is sold in competition with the cotton of the East and Egypt, but so far surpasses in quantity, and, in the case of India, in quality, that it holds its own. In neither country is the power of the State exerted to encourage the planting and push the sale. Russian petroleum is a more aggressive and dangerous rival to the American oil, and has succeeded, by treaty provision, in almost excluding the illuminating oil of the United States from certain markets. Neighborhood, and a large yield of heavy oils, have contributed in part to this result; but tariffs and prejudice are more potent influences, and are able even to overcome differences in price, quality and packing in favor of the American product. The rise in the price of illuminating oil during 1895 has given better returns to exporters than in any year since 1891, but the quantity was exceeded in 1894. Severe as the struggle for markets has been, the produce of the United States has been successful, and the exports of 1895—885,000,000 gallons—are only 13,000,000 less than the exports of the banner year, 1894. The increase was in Europe, and great as that has been it was not sufficient to compensate for the losses in the East.

If any single item among the imports fixes the attention, it is raw wool. This one article has been the subject of more political discussion and economic experiment than any other to be found in the list of imports or of domestic exports. Indeed, it has only occasionally figured to any importance as an article of export. It has been a source of pride that American wool has been used in the home market, and every safeguard taken to prevent its passing into foreign hands. At the outbreak of the civil war raw wool was being exported to the amount of about 1,000,000 pounds each year, but in only one year (1886) did the quantity again attain or exceed that limit. If 300,000 pounds were sent away in one year, the quantity would be considered a large one, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the return of 1894, 477,182 pounds, was abnormal. In 1895 the number of pounds exported was more than double the export of any previous year, and exceeded 4,000,000 pounds. The details are not so encouraging, for this quantity was mainly divided between Mexico—not a manufacturing country—and Canada, where a woollen industry does exist.

The success or failure of the experiment of free wool is yet to be determined. Since September the wools of the world have had free access to our markets for the first time since 1857, and the quantity imported shows the privilege is being extensively used, but it would be difficult to prove the imports excessive. In 1894 the uncertainties of what the issue of the tariff struggle would be nearly cut off importations of wool. In the previous year, 1893, when the movement was unhampered by any such uncertainty, the total imports were 172,433,838 pounds, of which 122,386,072 pounds were of the low grade carpet wools, not produced in the United States in quantities sufficient to meet the wants of the manufacturers. In eleven months of 1895 the imports exceeded those of the year 1893, and the full year 1895 will give a total of about 200,000,000 pounds. This increase is no more than occurred between 1892 and 1893, and, representing two years, cannot be regarded as unusual. What is noticeable is the increase in the finer grades—the clothing wools. In previous years an import of between 50 and 60 million pounds would be taken as a fair amount; in 1895 the quantity will be more than 90,000,000 pounds, or nearly one-half the entire wool importations. These larger importations of raw wools have been accompanied by smaller importations of woollen manufactures.

Prices of wools, both domestic and foreign, have ruled low, very low, and in adapting the home-growing interest to the new conditions introduced by the removal of the duty, some heavy losses were entailed. The sale of American sheep abroad has fluctuated widely. In 1883 the number was 337,251, and year by year the number lessened, until only 37,260 were exported in 1893. In 1895 the export of 1883 was slightly exceeded, but a few thousand in excess need create no apprehension, as proof of an unprofitable industry. The situation of wool is peculiar in every producing country, and enormous as the increased product has been, it is doubtful if any check will be felt on a still greater increase. In Australia the ranchmen are successfully overcom-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing one of the most serious obstacles to the extension of sheep raising, by sinking artesian wells and making pools or dams to retain the water for their stock. The great London dealers in wools, Messrs. Helmuth, Schwartz & Co., give a suggestive comparison in the wool production in 1884 and in 1893.

	1884. Pounds.	1893. Pounds.
England	132,000,000	151,000,000
Continent of Europe	450,000,000	450,000,000
North America	350,000,000	377,000,000
	932,000,000	978,000,000
Australia	408,000,000	632,000,000
Africa (Cape)	52,000,000	91,000,000
River Plate	322,000,000	365,000,000
Other	106,000,000	164,000,000
	888,000,000	1,252,000,000
Total	1,820,000,000	2,230,000,000

The increased product for the first group was 5 per cent.; for the second group 40.9 per cent.; and for both groups 22.5 per cent. While the populations of these countries have increased in the same time only 9.5 per cent., the yield of clean wool has increased 19.4 per cent. * This in itself should explain the low prices of wool, and in such matters an economic is more permanent than a political cause.

The movement in iron and steel also is looked upon as a fair measure of the industrial situation at home, and the same measure may be applied to the import and export trade. In 1882 the heaviest imports of iron and steel and manufactures were made, $70,551,497. Since that year the value has declined, and in 1894 was only $20,559,368—the lowest record since the end of the depression of 1873–79. In 1882 the exports of iron and steel and manufactures were valued at $20,748,206—an amount exceeded only in the single year 1871. In 1894 the exports were $30,106,482—a figure never touched before—and in 1895 this aggregate is surpassed by more than a million. Through the long list of articles included in this class of manufactures only a few show diminished exports; the losses on pig iron, band iron, cutlery, stationary engines and boilers, plate iron, printing presses, railroad bars and sewing machines, are more than compensated by the additions on wire, stoves, firearms and bar iron. Brazil is equipping her railroads with American engines; and if the Argentine Republic buys fewer locomotives of the United States, it takes more cars and more agricultural implements,

* Statistics given by Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both of which may widen the wheat area of that Republic and enable it to compete to an even greater extent with the wheat grower of the West.

The exports of copper ingots in 1894 greatly exceeded those of any previous year, and were in great part caused by its demand in electrical appliances. The movement in 1895 was less by nearly one-third though the price was sufficiently low to warrant an increased consumption. Before 1894 the largest export was 56,453,756 pounds sent chiefly to Europe in 1892; and an export of 146,000,000 in 1895 is not one to give occasion to any fears that copper of the United States can not hold its own against the products of Chili and Spain. The exports of copper ore have been declining for some years, and in 1895 barely one-fifth the quantity of 1892 will be sent to the only consumer—England. That country obtains large quantities of ore from Venezuela, Spain, Cape of Good Hope and even Newfoundland. France also imports the ore from Chili and in an indirect trade through England.

Such are some of the leading elements in the foreign trade of 1895. It would be interesting to discuss them from the revenue standpoint, and show where the $20,000,000 larger customs revenue was obtained, and how, through the fall in the price of sugar, the revenue was not greater. The West India Islands, whence the great supply of sugar is derived, are well known to be in a condition of decline, politically as well as economically. The market for sugar in the United States has been their main prop, and it could remain a support only while the prices paid for raw sugar covered the cost of production. It has been asserted for years that sugar could not profitably be grown under two cents a pound; and for more than six months and at the very time the cane sugar campaign is on, the price has been given at 1.7 cents for cane and 1.5 cents for beet. The political features of sugar need not detain us, however interesting it would be to speculate upon a continuance of the current low prices, and their effects upon the West Indies, Louisiana, and that complicated structure of bounty-fed beet sugar interest in Europe. So long as the consumers of the United States get their sugar cheap, it will be as well to leave the struggle between cane and beet products to the wisdom of other peoples. This is, indeed, necessary, because of the revenue from sugar.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be even more interesting to map out the great geographical lines of American commerce, and study the political consequences with a special reference to the American continent. The largest share of our trade is still with European countries, and must be for many years; but the commercial relations with our neighbors are capable of great development, and a commercial supremacy would involve other relations of high importance in the near future. With 1894 as a year of comparison, the imports in 1895 had increased from Europe, South America, Asia and Africa, and decreased from Canada and the West Indies, and Oceanica. A greater value of exports was sent to South America, Oceanica and Africa, while a less value went to Europe, Canada, the West Indies and Asia. The depression in Canada has been more severe than in the United States, and the war in Asia has had its effect on trade.

The experience of 1894 in foreign trade was trying to an extreme; that of 1895 has done much to repair losses, and more to prove how firmly are established the great branches of our trade. Sharp and concentrated as was the crisis of 1894, it was better to have an explosion and a ready recovery, than a long and lingering decline, followed by a sudden access of speculation and extravagant trading, ending as it always must end, in disaster.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW ADMINISTRATION IN ENGLAND.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, BART.

THE editor asks me, What will be the policy of the Unionist administration, supposing it to obtain legislative power? We may begin the answer to the question by setting aside some matters as certain not to be touched, in spite of the expectations of some in the electorate that they will be dealt with. It may safely be asserted that there will be no return to protection, that there will be no steps taken in the direction of bimetallism, and that nothing will be done for Church schools. The two former of these propositions will be at once accepted by competent judges. There may be doubt about the third. The archbishops and bishops of the Established Church, and the friends of voluntary schools, which are mainly Church schools, have been active lately, and although cold water has been poured upon them by Lord Salisbury, they undoubtedly expect that some, at all events, of their demands will be acceded to. On the other hand, the accession to office of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends will form so convenient an excuse to the Conservative party for not entering upon legislation which is never popular with the constituencies, that I maintain the opinion which I long since formed and have just expressed.

Leaving the negative and coming to the positive side of the programme, it may safely be foreshadowed that labor questions will be dealt with in a comprehensive, though not perhaps in a satisfactory nor a scientific, fashion. The Factory Bill of Mr. Asquith will probably be taken by his successors without much change, and this popular measure will probably become law in much the shape in which it was introduced by the Liberal administration. Mr. Asquith's Truck Bill will probably have the same fortune, but this bill will be hotly opposed by the Trades

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unionists, as it would have been even if it had gone forward under the auspices of the Liberal administration. It may be explained that "Truck" in its original sense meant the payment of wages otherwise than in cash, and that the early Truck legislation was directed against the practice which formerly prevailed widely of forcing workmen to deal at certain shops and pay too dear for their goods, and against kindred evils. Outside the ordinary range of the existing Truck acts lies a whole class of fines and deductions, which constitute a working-class grievance of the first magnitude. Stoppages are made from wages for all sorts of reasons, and in some cases ill-paid workers, such as girl factory hands, receive in cash only a small proportion of their nominal wage. Fines for coming late in the morning are an example of what is meant. These fines are far larger in amount than seems necessary for the purpose of securing punctuality of attendance, and the amount deducted for a short absence is vastly greater than the wage which could be earned in the time. Mr. Asquith's Truck Bill proposed that deductions should be illegal, except where assented to in writing by the worker, and, on being attacked, pronounced reasonable by a court. The former of these two provisions so closely resembles the contracting-out which was recently objected to by the Liberal party in the Employers' Liability Bill, when introduced into it by the House of Lords, that it stinks in the nostrils of the trades unionists. Contracting-out is a fruitful source of inefficiency in legislation. Excellent principles are laid down, but contracting-out is allowed, becomes a standing form, and makes the legislation nugatory.

Another bill left by the late government which a Unionist government may take up is Mr. Asquith's Coal Mines Regulation Bill, which is also far from popular with the working class, but into which an attempt may be made to insert a clause limiting the labor in mines of boys under a certain age. The Miners' Federation will undoubtedly fail in attempting to limit employment underground before twenty-one, and will probably fail in attempting to limit employment under eighteen, but is not unlikely to be successful in limiting employment under sixteen. The importance of this question lies in the fact that it is the difficulty about the boys which causes the resistance of Northumberland and Durham to legislation for the purpose of regulating hours in mines of adult men. If the labor of boys in mines were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limited to eight hours in any twenty-four, the practical objection of the Northumberland and Durham miners to the introduction of a similar limit to the labor of men would disappear, inasmuch as the men in Northumberland and Durham have no personal interest in the question, for they in all cases work considerably less than eight hours at the present time. Their boys, however, work longer; and it is commonly asserted in Northumberland and Durham that it is impossible to change the system under which two shifts of men work with one shift of boys, or three shifts of men with two shifts of boys. It is the opinion of the other miners that means for meeting the difficulty might easily be found.

Mr. Bryce's bill for the introduction of a new system of conciliation in trades disputes is not likely to be taken up by the Conservative party in its present form, but it is probable that some attempt will be made to deal with the subject by legislation which will probably be popular, and also, probably, prove useless. It is a thankless task to object to any scheme for arbitration or conciliation from which good is hoped; but experienced trades unionists are inclined to think that such legislation, if ambitious, is likely to be dangerous. The pressure of public opinion would be brought to bear to induce the parties to an industrial conflict to accept any arrangement that might have been made for them; but public opinion is represented by the press, and the press, in order to live, is forced to incline towards the side of wealth. The trades unionists think that well-organized industries are able to look after themselves, and that in others the workers must go to the wall, and that it is unnecessary to consecrate the system which may cover this result.

Of bills which have not been introduced and are not *remanets* from the Liberals, but which have been foreshadowed by Mr. Chamberlain and accepted by Lord Salisbury in speeches in the country, the chief are a Workmen's Compensation Bill, a bill for the allocation of local rates to the purchase of workmen s houses, and an old-age pension scheme. It is difficult at present to say much about this last as no very definite proposals have been made on behalf of the Unionist party, except by Mr. Chamberlain, and his proposals have not secured general acceptance. The difficulties of detail are very great. There is no definite recommendation by any committee or commission before the country, and it is far from certain that any proposals which might be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placed before Parliament would receive wide support. The other two proposals for legislation are more ripe. Mr. Chamberlain in opposing the Employers' Liability Bill of Mr. Asquith suggested a general bill for compensation in case of all injuries, and he has recently introduced a bill which has met with a somewhat favorable reception, although the objection has been urged that it does not provide for employers' liability for accidents by penal provisions. The proposal for the allocation of rates to the purchase of workmen's houses came from a Conservative quarter. It has been accepted by Mr. Chamberlain, who pleaded in its behalf the analogy of the allotments legislation. Allotments, however, do not become the freehold of the holder, and the freehold remains in the local authority which makes the advance. The proposal for assistance from rates to workmen to buy their houses contemplates the freehold being the possession of the workmen, and not of the local authority. On this ground the legislation will be strongly fought by many belonging to the more advanced parties; but it will pass.

It is very probable that the incoming Unionist administration may go forward with an Irish land bill, which would contain the portions of the Irish land bill of Mr. Morley which have the support of Mr. T. W. Russell, and that they may introduce an Irish local government bill. The latter measure, however, will have to be one giving to Ireland most of the municipal and local liberties which are possessed by Great Britain, and one far more advanced than Mr. Balfour's ill-starred bill of the last Parliament, if it is to have any chance of passing without a violent conflict. It is also possible that the Unionists may try their hands at temperance legislation. The local vote might be called in for the purpose of diminishing the number of public houses, with a compensation to be borne by the survivors.

The outgoing Liberal administration had not carried a strongly reforming policy into Indian, foreign, colonial, or military affairs, and there is no ground to suppose that the change of administration will imply a change of policy in these respects. A considerable improvement in the War Office had indeed been announced by the outgoing government on the night of its defeat, and there can be little doubt that the proposals then made will be adhered to by the incoming administration.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEO XIII. AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

BY THE REV. J. A. ZAHM, C. S. C.

ONE of the greatest questions of the day, it is admitted by all, is the social question, and its most illustrious exponent is, without doubt, the august Pontiff of the Vatican. Ever since his assumption of the tiara Leo XIII. has manifested a special interest in all problems relating to the welfare of society. This is abundantly evinced by his noble encyclicals on these topics, and by his numberless letters to eminent representatives of church and state.

In a private audience, with which I was favored not long since, the social question was introduced and discussed at some length. I ventured to tell his Holiness that the editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW had requested me to write an article on this subject, and that the people of America, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, were always pleased to give respectful and reverent attention to his utterances, and especially to all those in any wise bearing on the condition of the laboring classes.

"Ah, yes," he said, "the Americans are a noble people. I love them greatly. I am aware of the deep interest they take in social problems and was gratified to learn that they received so kindly my encyclical on the condition of labor. You may tell the people of the United States, through the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, that I shall always be ready to contribute to the fullest extent of my power towards their well-being and happiness, and especially towards the well-being and happiness of the wage-earners of their great republic.

"The social question," continued the venerable Pontiff, his eyes beaming with light and intelligence as he discoursed on the subject to which he attaches so much importance—"the social question is the great question of the future. *La question sociale, c'est la question de l'avenir.* It is a question in which all should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be interested, and each one should contribute his quota towards lessening and removing the difficulties with which it is at present beset. It is particularly desirable that ecclesiastics should be thoroughly conversant with the subject, and that they should take an active part in every discussion and in every movement that looks toward the betterment of the social condition of humanity, and especially the social condition of that major portion which must earn their bread by the sweat of their brow."

This is but a brief synopsis of what the Holy Father actually said, and conveys no idea whatever of the earnestness and impressiveness which characterized the spoken words of the large-hearted and noble-minded occupant of the chair of Peter. He dwelt particularly on his encyclicals *Immortale Dei* and *Rerum Novarum*, and referred incidentally to other documents, bearing on the same subjects, of which he is the author.

The encyclical *Longinqua Oceani Spatia*, recently issued, is, in a measure, but a supplement of the *Rerum Novarum*. I shall consider the two documents, therefore, in so far as they both deal with the social problem, as virtually one and the same.

So much by way of preamble. The following pages are designed to give a brief exposition of the origin, character and history of the social question from the Roman Catholic point of view, and to exhibit the gist of the Pope's teaching, as gathered from his letters and encyclicals on this all-important subject.

I.

A LITTLE more than a century ago, in 1791, the French Revolution abolished by a third and definitive decree the corporations which formed the basis of the old social order. In 1891, Leo XIII. promulgated a new economic charter, at the very moment when the industrial association, which was the outgrowth of the Manchester School, was approaching dissolution.

In lieu of the old organic *régime* the French Revolution substituted the reign of individualism. Unlimited competition, freedom of labor, the preponderance of capital and the general introduction of machinery ushered into existence the fourth estate proletarians, or wage-earners—and with it the social question. The organism became a mechanism, and from its excesses proceeded the evils from which we now suffer. As matters at present stand, we have two inimical forces, standing face to face;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on one side, the modern state with its army and its police; on the other, socialism and organized labor with its battalions and its long pent-up grievances.

Never before was humanity confronted with such a danger. It is related that when Antioch was taken by the Persians, A. D. 266, the entire population of the city was assembled in the theatre. The seats of this theatre were cut in the foot of the escarped mountain which crowned the ramparts. The eyes of all present were fixed on the chief actor; every ear was strained to catch his words, when suddenly his hands began to contract, his arms became paralyzed, and his eyes assumed a startling stare. From the stage on which he stood he beheld the Persians, already masters of the defences of the ill-fated city, rushing down the mountain with resistless impetuosity. At the same moment the enemy's arrows began to shower down within the precincts of the theatre, and to awaken its inmates to a realization of their perilous situation.

Is not our situation analagous? Have we not felt the earth tremble under our feet, and heard the social revolution, as Lassalle predicted it would, knock at our doors? And what augments the danger, is that the International seems decided on the policy of delay, until the natural pressure of our social condition shall place the reins of power in the hands of the "new masters." 1848 and 1870 appear to have been the last attempts of the Fourth Estate to achieve victory by force of arms. Its leaders are unwilling to commit new blunders, and are persuaded that the day will come when socialism will be triumphant.

Leo XIII. chose this prophetic hour to make known the social evangel to the combatants on both sides. Among the wrecks of human institutions, the Papacy remains the sole international power, sufficiently equipped, sufficiently sure of its own resources, sufficiently endowed with light and energy, to attempt the supreme work. It, alone, has imperturbable faith in the future of humanity. It is idealist, in spite of all deceptions; optimist, notwithstanding all the spasmodic weaknesses of the body politic. As in the politico-religious order, Leo XIII. has, through his encyclical, *Immortale Dei*, preached the code of reconciliation, so has he, in the economic order, promulgated the charter of social harmony. We recognize in the earnest, but tender words of the Pontiff, the divine perfume of the Master, the precise lessons of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Fathers of the Church, and the carefully pondered and the soundly democratic teachings of the Doctors of the Middle Ages. For the first time, economic science has pity on the wage-earner, and discusses the new issues raised without rancor or recrimination. At the same time it exhibits a respect for the rights of all while insisting on the duties of all, which will forever render the encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, not only the most glorious monument of the present pontificate, but also the most beneficent contribution yet made to the new order of things. In the Church alone is there a condition of stable equilibrium, which always remains unaffected. The personal character of the encyclical resides, not so much in the lessons of justice and charity as in the perfect adaptation of revealed truth to our present condition, and in the beautiful and fruitful manner in which the facts of history are harmonized with eternal principles.

Leo XIII. is at the same time as compassionate as a mother and as impassible as an anatomist; as just as a judge and as tender as an infant. He loves ardently that poor humanity which is so often blind to its best interests, but which is more frequently betrayed by its own leaders. In him the Papacy appears, even to-day, as the empyrean in which all hatreds and struggles are buried and in which all great reconciliations are effected. Indeed the most distinguishing characteristic of the encyclical is that it seeks to harmonize capital and labor, to reconcile employer with employee, to unite justice and charity.

The first part of the encyclical shows that the accord between labor and capital is one of the most beautiful and most consoling laws of political economy. As God, in the book of Job, "makes peace in the high places," so does Leo XIII., from the lofty eminence which he occupies, bring to men the peace-giving breath of the Infinite.

This equilibrium has its origin in the Pope's comprehensive genius. Leo XIII. knows not that exclusivism which divides the social order into separate compartments. His breadth of view and love of humanity preclude this. His keen intellect has grappled firmly with all the difficulties of the situation. Economists too often separate what should ever be united. One expects everything from the state, another looks for a cure only from above, while others still appeal for a solution of the problem to special associations or to private initiative. But Leo XIII.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embraces all these factors, and causes every one of them to make for the common weal. The Church, the State, individual activities, society as a whole, should not they be prodigal of their best efforts in helping forward the work of reconciliation ?

It is this harmony and breadth of view which give to the encyclical the character of arbitrament which it possesses, and make it, as it were, a kind of truce of God. Hence spring the facility with which the Pontiff steers clear of the quicksands of this vast world. And with what dangers is he not beset ? Intrinsic difficulties, technical difficulties, complexity of subject, a continual transformation of political economy, which scarcely permits one to promulgate doctrines and principles, antagonistic passions and rivalries—Leo XIII. has met all these obstacles.

Thanks to his marvellous competence and his profound knowledge of the subject-matter of debate ; his consummate art in separating theories from facts, and principles from remedies, Leo XIII. has avoided these reefs. He is at the same time a doctor and a practical man of affairs ; an illuminator and a conciliator ; resting here on the Gospel and St. Thomas Aquinas, and there seeking aid in the immense modern laboratory, where are found both men and hypotheses.

Such are the distinguishing notes of the encyclical ; its opportuneness, its evangelical character, its irenical harmony, its perfect comprehensiveness. These are combined with scientific precision and an incomparable simplicity of art, in which supreme elegance and exact science unite in sweetest symphony.

II.

WHAT, it may be asked, has occurred in society, that special exertion is now required to keep in motion a machine which formerly moved of itself without noise and without effort ? In what does this much-talked-of social question consist ? All are making the same inquiry, but the responses given are as diverse as the prescriptions of physicians. More than ever before the world is brought to face seriously the social question. Formerly certain minor social questions perturbed humanity, but the crisis which now confronts us is peculiar to our own epoch.

It is only the foolish hope of interested optimists which will lead men to believe that they are sheltered from the impending catastrophe, because, forsooth, the same endemic malady has be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore raged in all countries and at all times. It is, indeed, true that social antagonism is not something new or something peculiar to our century. But there is between the past and the present this essential difference. Formerly, after the struggle between employer and employee was over, rest and peace were to be found in the workshop or in the home, whereas to-day the struggle has reached our very hearthstones. It persists in a dull and sullen manner, when it does not break forth openly, and it is ever compassing the ruin of society because it is incessantly destroying all chance of domestic happiness. Never before, indeed, has the social question knocked in so threatening a manner at the doors of the civil order.

In the introduction to his epoch-making document, Leo XIII. directs attention to some of the evidences of the dominant evil—extreme riches, extreme misery, and the indescribable desolation which has entered the world of the proletariate in consequence of the atomization of society under the levelling reign of capital.

Gifted with a methodical mind and endowed with a rare genius for classification, the Pope limits himself to indicating the roots of the evil, without entering into details, or descending to investigations of secondary importance.

It may truly be said that the social question arises from a five-fold revolution: the revolution in machinery; the revolution in political economy; the revolution in religion; the revolution in the state, and the revolution brought about by the general movement of humanity.

Machinery, or rather the abuse of machinery, was the first to effect a transformation in the economic order. It is not without reason that Lassalle styles it "the revolution incarnate"—*Die verkörperte Revolution.* Machinery has revolutionized the mode of production, the manner of labor, and the distribution of revenue and of property. It has destroyed the workshop and introduced the factory in its stead. It has sterilized manual labor and, by its immense productivity, has internationalized prices and markets. While, on the one hand, it has created the despotism of capital, it has, on the other, called into existence the unorganized army of the proletariate. It has ground humanity into a powder, without cohesion and without unity, and has placed the world of labor at the mercy of a few soulless plutocrats. This new order of things means the reign of the few; it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

implies the permanence of expropriation and the resurrection of ancient Rome, where millions of slaves were trampled under foot by an insolent oligarchy of wealth. And finally, by its fatal centralization, machinery has engendered a double International —the International of capital and the International of socialism.

Against such a condition of things there should have been erected some sort of protecting dike. But instead of creating a new order, in conformity with the changed mode of production, economic science introduced into the laws and institutions of the land those very principles which have rendered the influence of machinery sinister and destructive. Of an agency marvellously rich in its potentialities, it has made an engine of revolution. Production, production, nothing but production, such has been the ideal, the last word of the Third Estate and of economists. Adam Smith in England, J. B. Say in France, and Schulze-Delitsch in Germany, have traced out this new legislation, with a view to bringing out of machinery all its latent force, without ever thinking of the terrible confusion that was sure to ensue.

Science and politics have leagued together to render the state omnipotent. How then could socialism regard with serenity a factor of such unquestioned power ?

Absolute collectivism was born and received with acclamation in the *comitia* of the people before it was scientifically promulgated by Carl Marx. The sons of toil constitute the majority. Why are they not then the rulers ?

Riehl, before Sainte-Beuve, had drawn the portrait of the literary proletarian as the guide of the laboring proletarian. *Declassé* and a conspirator, ambitious, jealous and vindictive, he finds a use for his knowledge in giving his services to the advancement of revolutionary socialism. A German, Riehl spoke for the Germans. But have not his prognostications been everywhere verified ? You have supplied outcasts and the declassed with all modern arms—education, universal suffrage, literature. You have awakened them to a consciousness of their power. You have taught them that law is the voice of the majority, that education is the stepping-stone by which they may attain to power. You have endowed them with sovereignty. You have made them legislators and judges. Why, then, should not the masses rise up and announce to the Third Estate : We are the masters ?

Politics and their historical environment created Lassalle and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Carl Marx. Lassalle and Carl Marx created militant socialism and the International.

"Liberalism," says Averbeck, "has acted as a state would act if it should banish a part of its citizens to a solitary island and let them there begin a struggle for existence. This state gives to the exiles all the treasures of science—libraries and scientific apparatus—but it withholds from them what is necessary for subsistence. It is to be presumed that such unfortunates will burn the books in order to warm themselves and break the instruments in order to make tools that will enable them to gain the necessities of life." The same writer was likewise one of the first to signalize the perils of this political and social contrast. To day the situation seems even more grave. For, has not the International the same engines of war as the State? Has it not to hand all the appliances requisite to start a revolution? The stupefied Liberals persist in persecuting the Church, in weakening the ethical sense, and dancing on a volcano until everything shall be blown to atoms.

Do we not read the signs of the times? One would declare that everything conspires to crown the Fourth Estate. As far back as 1810 there were not wanting far-seeing synthetic minds, who foresaw that the reign of social democracy would issue in the natural and fatal termination of civilization. Philosophers and critics have expended an infinite amount of wit in their attempts to give a definition of civilization, but no two have been able to agree on the same definition. The events of our day, however, make a definition unnecessary, for we have before our very eyes the most salient facts of all history past and present. For what is the evolution of humanity but its expansion and progressive exaltation?

All the theories of philosophers and all the preachments of exploiters are of no avail. We are moving toward a triumphant democracy. Whether the transformation of the aristocratic and *bourgeois* society into a democratic society be slow or prompt, violent or peaceful, it is none the less inevitable; and more than this, none the less irrevocable, once it shall have been effected.

There are several reasons in explanation of the difficulty of a return. All men are not sensible of the exalted charm of liberty, and freedom is not an imperative need for a large number of men. But the sweetness of equality appeals strongly to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most feeble intelligences, and men are slow to renounce this pleasure when they have once tasted it. Besides this, the laws and customs of a democratic society are in accord with certain ideas of right and justice, and they find in the conscience as well as in the passions of men a powerful support.

What intensity marks this movement! What a formidable support for the Fourth Estate! And how singular the coincidence of this general current with the present economic crisis. Sieyès wrote: "What is the Third Estate? Nothing. What ought it to be? Everything." Is it astonishing that the chiefs of the International apply these words to the Fourth Estate?

We have briefly considered the five confluents which constitute the river of the social question. Never has a more complicated situation, or one more pregnant with peril, weighed upon men. What were the invasions of the barbarians from the north of Europe, or the upheavals of the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, in comparison with the threatened explosion of this vast world already stirred to its profoundest depths and in a state of violent ebullition?

Has not the time at length come when some one should speak in the name of all and above all; when some one should take up the problem, not with the pedantry of party, nor with affected scholastic display, but with a keen and serene intellect which is competent to get at the heart of things without becoming entangled, and is capable of taking a comprehensive survey of the situation without getting confused? Is there not required one of those rare men with whom conscience in everything is a prime necessity and whose greatest pleasure and recompense lie in the laborious pursuit of good and in the absolute discharge of duty?

Such an one is Leo XIII. With that buoyant and indomitable spirit which has never known weakness, of which age has respected the integrity, Leo XIII., after having disentangled, analyzed and scrutinized all the elements of debate, has judged it necessary, not only as a man of science, but also as supreme teacher, to undertake the great work of synthesis and truth.

III.

SINCE issuing his famous encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, of which Europe, poisoned by the School of Manchester and by the teachings of a materialistic philosophy, had greater need than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

young and prosperous America, Leo XIII. has developed his apostolic doctrine more in detail. This is observed especially in his letters to the Count de Mun, the Bishop of Grenoble, the Bishop of Liège, the Cardinal of Mechlin, as well as in his letters to M. Decurtins, to Abbé Six, to Abbé Naudet and others. All these manifestations of the great Papal mind are bound together by the same golden thread. Go to the people to assist and emancipate them. Establish syndicates and associations for the laboring classes. Demand from the State legislation for their protection, and strive to secure the passage of a law, international in character, which shall protect at the same time both employer and employee from economic piracy. Restrict the hours of labor, and place women and children under proper protection. Give to the poor man a just remuneration for his work, and strive to make him an upright and honorable citizen. Above all, see that religion is the inspiring and directing soul of the home, for without it the work of reconstruction and regeneration is impossible.

That which, above all else, brings out in bold relief the solicitude of Leo XIII. for the laboring man is the injunction which he lays on, the mission which he commits to, the priests of the Church. He wishes them to go forth into the market-place, to visit the factories, to found societies for workingmen, to inaugurate conferences for them, and thus to direct the large democratic and social current which is the result of long ages of effort, labor and sacrifice. To Americans, with their native activity and independence, this is easy and natural. It, however, demanded evangelical courage to impose this on the Old World, where three centuries of renaissance of pagan law, and a century of *laissez-faire* and *laissez-passer* have atomized society and divided the human family into two opposing camps—on one side the tyranny of the law and of the employer; on the other, renewed servitude and virtual rebellion—everywhere hatred, lack of equilibrium, egotism and overt struggle.

One of the most striking characteristics of the Pope's teaching anent the labor problem is his return to the ideas of evangelical solidarity, to the lessons of social wisdom, and to the principles which governed the guilds of the middle ages—all of which, with singular skill, he adapts to the needs and conditions of the century just closing. Sometimes reactionaries, and even English Liberals, reproach the Pope with going too far and with favoring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

methods which are regarded as revolutionary. In the eyes of such people he is a Socialist. This revolutionist, however, but relights the almost extinguished torch of Christian traditions. He is simply continuing the spirit of the early ages of the Church. "The day when there shall be placed in the chair of St. Peter," wrote de Vogué in his *Spectacles Contemporains*, "a Pope animated with the sentiments of Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Manning, the Church will stand forth before the world as the most formidable power it has ever known." So be it. Is not Leo XIII. such a Pontiff? Fearlessly brushing aside three centuries of cabinet diplomacy, he declares his intention of following the traditions of those illustrious pontiffs who are honored in history as social law-givers and emancipators of the people. He synthesizes admirably the Gospel, St. John Chrysostom, St. Thomas, Gregory VII., Alexander IV., Pius IV., and many others besides. "The danger is imminent," wrote Madam Adam in her *Patrie Bourgeoise*, "for Leo XIII. is preparing a crusade which a younger Pope may render triumphant. The constitution of the Church and individual devotedness, which Christianity, we must admit, is capable of exalting, in a far higher degree than the philosophy of Paul Bert, are calculated to provoke one of those grand movements of moral reform which are always based on a social movement." Madam Adam forgets that it is not a crusade, but a return to the principles of economic and organic mutuality which obtained before the Renaissance, and an adaptation of them to the age in which we live. This is what Leo XIII. told Castelar, the Spanish Republican, in so many words. "It is necessary," said he, "to bring back the Church to its original traditions." In this declaration are revealed at once the historic mind and the originality of Leo XIII. In it are disclosed his greatness and the unity and majestic coordination of all his acts and all his teachings.

Economically and socially, the Renaissance, the resurrection of pagan law, the cult of exaggerated individualism, the philosophy which issued in Darwinism, have again brought back and made general both the pride and the slavery of ancient Rome. Absolute and pagan theories regarding property, exaltation of liberty, which, while it is the honor of the human mind in the domain of politics, is folly in the domain of economic science, substitution of an artificial mechanism for the normal organism,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rupture with industrial organizations and the atomization of society—in a word, all the miseries of our modern world have proceeded from these sources. Our age is, indeed, but a walled-in field of battle, in which egotism, individual interests and passions are engaged in homicidal combat. Formerly society was an edifice, in which each social floor had its protection, its right, its security, its well-being. It was, to employ another figure, a vast organism, in which each member, while it was subject to the law governing the whole, had its proper function and its full life.

It is this thought, eminently Christian and eminently evangelic—a thought reposing on justice and love—which is the mainspring of the social action of the Holy Father. Here, as elsewhere, Leo XIII., while always having a regard for the times in which we live, supplies us with the traditional means of subsistence and defence. A man of the past and of the future, continuing in his own beneficent way the policy of his illustrious predecessors, while at the same time paving the way for a better to-morrow—without change of principles, but by the application of new methods—the present Pontiff stands conspicuous in history as an innovator, while he is all the while but a priest of the antique ideal, but an ideal appropriated for our own time.

Besides the teachings of antiquity there are other guides nearer to us for pontifical initiative. A conservative power, the Papacy scarcely ever moves in advance of the political and social exigencies of an epoch. It does not create, it codifies.

The Fathers have determined with precision this law of organic growth. Origen, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and, above all, St. Vincent of Lerins, have developed the philosophy of this phenomenon. It is thus that they speak of a *sensus theologicus*, of an *intelligentia ecclesiastica*, of a *sensus Catholicus*, which are affirmed, expanded and translated in a body of doctrines, in *eodem sensu et in eodem dogmate*.

In a lower degree, the Papacy appropriates and condenses the human teachings of each epoch in so far as they bear on the immutable principles of the evangelical and traditional deposit. In every direction in which the energies of the Church are employed, we remark a formal evolution of this institution which is in relation to the evolution of the ideas and the facts of the contemporary world. With the plastic power, which is *par excellence* the sign of her vitality, the Church adapts herself in our days to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the service of societies formed outside of herself, and often opposed to her, as she adapted herself to the feudal system, to the Renaissance, and to all the metamorphoses of its flock. Her work, sometimes, illudes the careless observer, because it goes on by processes which resemble the mysterious processes of growth and development in the higher organisms. Under the action of vital force all the atoms of our body are continually being changed and renewed, but our form and personality are in nowise modified thereby. It is in this sense that we must understand the renovation of the Church and the Papacy.

The Church and the Papacy are never in a hurry. In everything which does not concern eternity, in the domain of the contingent and the relative, her rôle is not to anticipate, but to regulate and to consecrate all the progress definitively made. Some thinkers urge, as an objection and as examples of unexplainable variation, the misfortunes of certain bold spirits, who, in the past, were blamed for having maintained political and social doctrines which were subsequently cordially received by the Vatican. These innovators had started too soon. Political truths, essentially relative, do not become complete verities and acceptable to Rome save at the moment when they appear practical, or when the circumstances of time and place clearly evince that the fruit is ripe and may be gathered. In all that concerns herself, the Church is the sole judge of this moment.

The encyclical on the condition of labor and other similar acts of Pope Leo XIII. are the official and permanent consecration of the labors and the teachings of the most devoted Catholics of this century in respect of the social question.

The first one after Ozanam, or the Viscount de Melun, to make a deep impression on Rome in this matter, was Bishop Ketteler, of Mayence. It was in 1848, when socialism appropriated all the new economic currents, that he promulgated his social evangel. His sermons, preached in the Church of St. Paul, at Frankfort, at the time of the celebrated diet; his conferences with workingmen; his book on "Christianity and Labor"; his discourses at Mayence; all his acts as bishop and statesman had this ideal: Save, emancipate the Fourth Estate by the application of the Gospel and the doctrines of St. Thomas to the economic conditions of the day.

A man of dauntless courage, comprehensive mind and noble

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heart, he was at the same time a Catholic Lassalle. At one time, even, Bismarck seriously thought of making him Archbishop of Cologne, and of undertaking with him the great work of social reconstruction. The *Kulturkampf*, which the Iron Chancellor inaugurated in order to placate the national liberals, to break the power of Rome and to divide France, rendered this grandiose project illusory. Ketteler, however, did not abandon his plans. While the storms raged above the German forests he gathered about him those gallant heroes: Vogelsang, Kuefstein, Scheicher, Hitze, Joerge, Monfang, Schorlemer, Brandts, Bachem, and all that chosen band, who, even in our own day, with less *élan* and more timidity, it is true, continue to develop his ideas. At the Council of the Vatican, before the cannon of Sedan had startled Europe, the Bishop of Mayence hoped to secure official recognition of his programme, and thus bring the laboring world within the orbit of the Church. But this fondly cherished hope was not realized. "And to think"—he complained to the Archbishop of Rouen—"to think that we have not been able to utter that cry of love and sympathy to the outcasts of the century!"

But the seed which he sowed germinated. On the morrow of this same war, a representative of France took up the idea which had its birth beyond the Rhine. Supported by the teachings of Leplay and Perin, the Count de Mun, with the volcanic fire of his eloquence, continued the social crusade. He soon succeeded in rallying around himself such soldiers as La Tour du Pin, P. Pascal, M. Lorin, Abbé Noudet, Abbé Bataille, Abbé Six, M. Sabatier, and, above all, Cardinal Langénieux and M. Leon Harmel, who led to the Pope the first workingmen's pilgrimage.

At this same epoch, the Abbé Pottier, professor at Liège, in Belgium, discovered his vocation for social work. A priest and a theologian, he had a singular love for the poor, and was possessed of a judgment that was almost infallible. From the Gospel he drew forth a whole body of social doctrine, and found a sanction for his apostolate in the highest fonts of Christianity. His programme is an irrefutable, economic codification of the doctrines of the Holy Fathers and of the Doctors of the Middle Ages. In spite of all the attacks which have been directed against it, it remains impregnable. Around him also have gathered a zealous body of co-workers like the Kurths, the Levies, the de Harles, the Vetragens, and hosts of others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then, again, there is M. Decurtens, a layman. A born democrat, and a counsellor of the nation, he is as ardent an ultramontane as he is an imperturbable socialist. A leader of the laboring classes and a man of broad culture, erudite, eloquent, and energetic, he is endowed with not only an incomparable capacity for work, but also with an incomparable power of will.

He it was who effected in Switzerland the fusion of the labor organizations, Catholic and Protestant. He it was who induced his government to convoke an assembly of all the Estates in order to consider universal, social legislation—a project which was frustrated by William II. It is he, too, who makes periodical pilgrimages to the Vatican to engage the Holy Father to direct the social movement of our time. He has many rivals and imitators, but the noblest spirits of Helvetia are with him.

Such, in brief, is the Latino-Germanic genesis, if I may so express myself, of the encyclical.

The Anglo-Saxon race furnished the Pope with reason for action. Here appear Manning, Gibbons, Ireland and Keane, the last three of whom are better known, and more highly appreciated, in Europe than in their own country. They are men of ardor and action, always optimists, ever alert and never discouraged. Both by vocation and by environment they are leaders. Disentangled from the conventionalities of the Old World, they are more free than their European *confrères*; their faith is more pronounced and their word has the true ring of the Gospel of Christ.

As an American, I am proud that the sacred spark which set Europe and the Vatican aflame was supplied by our own favored land. In 1887, when the memorial concerning the Knights of Labor was forwarded to Rome, the Christian world still hesitated. But this document was the trumpet note which settled the issue. Rome spoke, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* was promulgated, and timid, Catholic Europe breathed a sigh of relief.

Such, then, are the origin, the character and the history of the social idea of Rome. Leo XIII. has been the grand resultant of a historical movement. It is because he was obedient to the laws of history, and because he understood the social needs of his time, that he deserves to be known forever as the Pope of the workingmen and the great high-priest of our century.

J. A. ZAHM, C. S. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE SECOND EMPIRE.

VIII.—PROSPERITY AND SOCIAL SPLENDOR.

BY ALBERT D. VANDAM, AUTHOR OF "AN ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS," "MY PARIS NOTE-BOOK," ETC., ETC.

THERE is one fact connected with the Second Empire which the nobodies who have lorded it over France since the Empire's fall have not been able to explain away. I allude to the unprecedented prosperity the country enjoyed during those eighteen years. All their attempted explanations to that effect are lame and more than lame; they cannot even limp along; they are positively paralyzed by subsequent facts. The impartial observer, whether he be a Frenchman or a foreigner, who happens to have lived in France under the *régime* of Napoleon III. and under that of the Third Republic cannot help pointing out that during the first-named period the peasant, and for that matter the townsman too, had his "fowl in the pot"; a condition of things which was considered by Henri IV.—not a bad king as kings went in those days—the height of a country's welfare.

The answers to such a remark come glibly enough, and in many instances they are partly epigrammatic, partly philosophical.

"That 'fowl in the pot' on which you lay so much stress," retorted a Republican, "was simply the 'goose with the golden eggs'; the nation was eating both her interest and her capital." That, I maintain, is an absolute falsehood. It could be proved over and over again, if it were necessary, that the war expenses and the war tax of five milliards of francs were paid out of the savings of the population during the previous fifteen or sixteen years, that scarcely an acre of ground was either mortgaged or sold during the two or three years after the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treaty of Frankfort by those who invested their moneys in those loans. To adduce such proofs would lead me too far astray. I may mention, however, that in many of the smaller provincial centres those loans were almost entirely subscribed in what appeared to be newly minted gold and newly issued bank-notes, both of which tenders, though, turned out on closer examination to have been minted and issued six, seven, eight and twelve years before. The moneys had simply been lying idle during the whole of that time in the linen presses of the peasantry and the *petite bourgeoisie* in accordance with a system that has prevailed in France ever since the peasantry and *petite bourgeoisie* had something to save, a system which will not be entirely abandoned within the next century, if then. If further proofs were wanted of the unexampled prosperity of France between 1855–70, they would be found in a comparison of the reports of the Poor Law Board (*Assistance Publique*) during the Citizen Monarchy and the Third Republic with those of the Second Empire.

It would be sheer folly to pretend that there was no poverty in France during the Second Empire. But from various causes the attitude of "Fortune's favorites" towards the indigent was different from what it is to-day. The self-sufficient, pompous, quasi-virtuous big-wig of the Third Republic flatters himself that he owes his position to talents, energy, and perseverance. Though he can be lavish at times, he is rarely generous; he contents himself with being just—according to his own lights. In the majority of cases he has never had the handling of large sums of money until he wheedled himself or was pitchforked into parliament, diplomacy or office, and, what is worse for the poor, he knows his position to be insecure, and that, therefore, he must make hay while the sun shines.

It is doubtful if the big-wig of the Second Empire ever entertained those fears of relapsing into obscurity and straitened means. Whether talented or not, he was less impressed with his own "high and mightiness" than the Republican. Those whom I have known were almost inclined to laugh in their sleeves at the idea of a providential mission on the part of Queen Hortense's son, let alone at their own share in such a mission. Not a few grinned behind the backs of the worshippers at the Napoleonic shrine, but until a short time before the collapse all had great faith in the cleverness of the high priest, and above all in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"star." And inasmuch as he, the high priest, convinced that his "star" would never fail him, gave freely, without stint, almost too lavishly, and certainly too indiscriminately, the majority of his court followed suit in that respect as in every other.*

And in spite of the Republicans' frequent assertions to that effect, Louis Napoleon's charity was *not* the result of political and dynastic calculation. It proceeded from the wish to enjoy life himself and to make every one around him enjoy it; for he was essentially the *bon-vivant* in the widest and most beneficent acceptation of the term; the *bon-vivant* whom Marivaux had in his mind's eye when he said, "*Pour être assez bon, il faut l'être trop.*" His charming ways, his amiability in all things, his disinterested generosity, his appreciation of humor, even when it was directed against himself, have never been surpassed by any monarch; and as a consequence, perhaps no monarch—Charles II. included—has contributed more to his own downfall than he. One instance of that amiability, which under the circumstances might well be called culpable neglect to checkmate his enemies in time, must suffice here. On the 3d November, 1863, Thiers and many other avowed opponents of the Empire resumed their seats at the Palais Bourbon. Morny, in his opening speech as President of the Chamber, alluded in graceful terms to the reappearance of some of his former parliamentary colleagues. "I rejoice to see them once more, and have no doubt about the loyalty of their intentions," he said. The next morning Morny paid a visit to the Emperor, who complimented him on his eloquence. "Nevertheless," added Napoleon with a smile, "it strikes me that your reference to the election of M. Thiers was a little—well, a little too intense. You are reported to have said: 'As for myself, I

*After the fall of the Empire, thousands of begging letters were found at the Tuileries, nearly all of which were annotated in the handwriting of the Emperor himself, mentioning the sums that had been sent in reply. He spent on an average £140,000 per annum in that way—thus £2,500,000 during the eighteen years of his reign. When we consider that this same man left an income of less than £5,000 to his widow, the reader will agree that the words lavish and indiscriminate are not misplaced. We are not concerned here with the private fortune of the Empress, for although it is true that she pledged her jewels in the beginning of September, 1870, in England, in order to face the immediate expenses for herself and her small band of followers, *it is by no means certain that necessity compelled that step.* With regard to the late Emperor's invincible belief in his "star," here is another proof. By his will, drawn up while he was still on the throne, everything was left to the Empress, not the smallest provision having been made for the son whom he loved with a deep-seated, almost idolatrous affection. It was because Napoleon III. felt confident that his "star" would prolong his days until he had seen that son firmly established as his successor on the throne. In that case there would have been no necessity to provide for him, and it would have been but right that the Empress should enjoy the revenues. But for that will the Prince Imperial might be alive and on the throne of his father, for he would certainly not have gone to Zululand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rejoice, etc., etc.' Does not 'rejoice' convey a little too much ?" Morny pointed out that he had referred to former colleagues with whom he had then been on the best of terms, and so forth. "Yes, yes," retorted the Emperor gaily ; "I had better make up my mind to it ; I am surrounded by enemies. There is no doubt about it, you are an Orleanist ; decidedly, you are an Orleanist."

The note relating this incident is couched in somewhat critical terms, an unusual tone for my grand-uncles to adopt. It goes on as follows : "I do not like the way things are drifting at the Château (Tuileries). Every one there seems to be master except the master himself. Politics are discussed in the interval between two dances by men and women who have no more idea of such matters than our cook has of anatomy, dissecting and operating. I dare say our cook would indignantly refute such a charge of ignorance by triumphantly pointing to the fowl she has trussed or the joint she has trimmed, and it would be vain on my part, I suppose, to make her understand the difference between operating upon a live body and a dead one. And the Empire, though by no means a healthy body, is very much alive. A few months ago I read a book on *The French Revolution*, by an Englishman,* and one passage struck me as particularly pertinent to the present state of affairs. 'Meanwhile it is singular how long the rotten will hold together, provided you do not handle it roughly.' I am afraid those twenty-three newly elected deputies, five of whom have sat in the Chamber for the last six years, are going to handle the Empire roughly, and the mistake of the Emperor lies in his having given them a chance. He ought to have prevented their return by hook or by crook. The man who made a clean sweep of at least ten times their number twelve years ago ought not to have afforded any of them an opportunity now of making a clean sweep of him ; for that, assuredly, is what they will endeavor to do.

"How long they will have to wait for such an opportunity it would be difficult to determine, but when that opportunity comes they will be ready for it. In fairness to them it should be said that they do not disguise their intentions ; the noise they make in preparing their brooms—by stamping the handles on the ground in the orthodox fashion—is loud enough to awaken

* Carlyle's.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any one who is not wilfully deaf; but they are either that at the Tuileries, or else their own buffooning prevents them from hearing as well as seeing what is going on around them. From what I gather it is not easy to decide whether the latest *travestis* of Meilhac and Halévy and Offenbach are the pure outcome of these gentlemen's imaginations, or simply a faithful picture of some of the scenes enacted now and then at the Château—unless the scenes at the Château are a deliberate attempt to imitate, nay to surpass, Mdlle. Schneider, Léonce and their fellow artists. The gods, demi-gods, heroes and heroines of Homer, as portrayed by the authors of *Orphée aux Enfers* and *La Belle Hélène*, and set in motion by that truly magic music of Maître Jacques, are assuredly not more astounding to the unsophisticated, and for that matter to the sophisticated, than a great many of the warriors, clericals, *grandes dames* and *grands seigneurs* constituting the innermost circle at the Court. What, after all, is the high priest Calchas to that astonishing Abbé Bauer, the latest fad, I am told, in the way of ascetic, but at the same time elegant, Christianity? He is a convert; he was educated for the Jewish ministry, and if everything the people state be true, Judaism is well rid of him. It appears that a little while ago the abbé tried to convert Adolphe Crémieux, for Crémieux, though baptized when quite an infant, is distinctly a Jew and not a Catholic; a Jew, moreover, of whom Judaism throughout the world may well feel proud. Of course, the conversion of such a man as Crémieux, if at all feasible, could not be accomplished by an Abbé Bauer, who was more than roughly handled in the encounter. Bauer, however, in spite of his quasi-refined exterior, is a vulgarian to his fingers' ends and thick-skinned besides. Crémieux's hard hitting did not make him wince, and at the end of the interview he said: 'I am very much surprised at your views about the founder of our religion, for I really believe that you are so liberal a Jew as to have legally defended Christ if you had lived in His time.' 'That I certainly should have done,' replied Crémieux, 'and, what is more, I should have got Him acquitted —unless—unless I had been obliged to put the like of you in the witness-box for the defence.' More scathing than even this is Monseigneur Dupanloup's criticism on Abbé Bauer's first sermon before the Court. The preacher, in spite of the warnings of his superiors, had given too much prominence to the Virgin in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

address. '*Place aux dames,*' said the Bishop of Orleans. 'According to Abbé Bauer there is no God, and the Virgin Mary is His mother.'

"I may be permitted to doubt, though, whether this treatment *à l'ancien régime* of sacred subjects, or rather the reintroduction of the perfumed, theatrical, and too worldly abbé into Court circles, by which the Empress wishes to emphasize her admiration for Marie-Antoinette, her surroundings and legitimacy in general, is calculated to give the nation a very exalted opinion of their rulers. One does not want a John Knox thundering against everything, nor does one want an Abbé Bauer 'under-studying' the rôle of a Cardinal de Rohan. Monseigneur Dupanloup, notwithstanding the sally just quoted, is a highly gifted, worthy, and absolutely disinterested prelate. He is thoroughly imbued with the dignity of his sacred office, and although very militant at all times, and often abrupt and the reverse of amiable, he would not condescend to enact the buffoon, or instruct his clergy to that effect, for no matter how good a cause. He would not do evil that good might come. But a great many of his fellow-prelates do not possess the same tact and discrimination. They fulminate, or allow their clergy to fulminate, against the vices and foibles of the hour in a manner which is apt to breed as much contempt for the would-be physician as for the patient. Not long ago a parish priest, inveighing against the *can-can,* actually held up the two sides of his cassock and performed some steps in the pulpit to show his flock how the Holy Virgin danced and how they, his flock, should dance. That priest decidedly beats Calchas in *La Belle Hélène,* but there is a warrior at the Court who beats both the *curé,* the Calchas and the Agamemnon of the opéra-bouffe. This is no other than Count Tascher de la Pagerie, who imitates barn-yard fowls, the sun and the moon, by making idiotic grimaces at the command of his imperial mistress, and who is 'trotted out' on all occasions for the amusement of visitors. Count Tascher does not think it incompatible with his rank in the army, his relationship to the Emperor and his position of Chamberlain to the Empress to oblige in that way. He is prouder of those accomplishments than of his birth, the brave deeds of his father, and of everything else besides. After that, people need not wonder at Gustave Doré's performing somersaults and standing on his head for his own amusement, and at his announced in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tention of abandoning his own career, in which he has already won much fame, for that of Auriol, the clown.

"And it is more than probable that in the intervals of his clowning, this same Count Tascher pretends to lend a hand in the steering of the 'ship of State,' for the Tuileries is fast becoming a '*cour du roi Pétaud et chacun y parle haut.*'*

"The worst of it is that those whose very existence as a body depends upon their unquestioning obedience and abstention from comment until such comment is invited are becoming infected with the prevailing mania for laying down the law on every conceivable subject. When I say 'becoming infected' I put it mildly; in reality they have set the example—I mean the army. I have seen enough of soldiering to know the inestimable value of silent obedience to the orders of one's superiors. The order may be wrong, and tantamount to a death sentence to its recipient; he is bound to carry it out to the letter. And yet, with the examples of Lords Lucan and Cardigan at Balaclava before them, French officers will go on discussing orders, not only from a military point of view but from a political.

"One instance in point will suffice. The delinquent is gone, and peace be to his ashes! for he was a brave and honorable soldier. But his well-known bravery and uprightness, and, above all, his position near the Emperor as aide-de-camp, called for more circumspection on General de Cotte's part than he exercised on the occasion alluded to. The thing happened a few evenings before the Emperor's departure for the Franco-Austrian war. General de Cotte was on duty at the time, and after dinner went down to the smoking-room set apart for the military and civil household. 'The thing is settled,' he said aloud, lighting a cigarette; 'in a day or two we shall be on our way to Italy, unless Providence and the Lunacy Commissioners stop us at the first stage at Charenton.'† Half an hour later the general went upstairs to the Empress's drawing-room. He had scarcely entered

* In olden times the mendicants, in imitation of the guilds, corporations, and communities in France, annually elected a king, who took the title of King Pétaud, from the Latin *peto*. In *Tartuffe*, Orgon's mother compares her son's house to the court of King Pétaud. "*On n'y respecte rien, chacun y parle haut,*" she says.

† Charenton is the well-known madhouse just outside Paris. At the news of the declaration of war in 1870 Prince Napoleon made a similar remark. He was on his way to the East with Ernest Renan. "Reverse your engines," he said to the master of the yacht; "we are going back." "Where to, monseigneur?" was the question. "To Charenton." The reply was quoted as something spitefully witty and original. It was spiteful, but not original.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the apartment when the Emperor came up to him with a smile. 'My dear general,' he remarked, quietly, 'I have too much respect for the opinion of others, even when they are diametrically opposed to mine, to ask people to fight battles the causes for which they do not approve. You will remain in Paris with the Empress.'

"That did not suit the general's book at all; but he did not utter a word in defence, he only bowed. He was, in fact, too astonished at his comment having reached the ears of the Emperor so soon. As far as he was aware, no servant had entered the room while he was there. He was, then, reluctantly compelled to conclude that an equal had played the part of tell-tale; and that alone would convey a fair idea of the code of honor that obtains among the immediate *entourage* of the sovereigns. Nevertheless, he was not going to be left out of the fighting, so on the 14th of May he simply had his horses and baggage taken to the Imperial train, selected a seat in an empty compartment, and only showed his face at Marseilles. The Emperor merely smiled and held out his hand. This is a sample of the Emperor's amiability, of his willingness to let bygones be bygones."

My notes contain a hundred similar anecdotes, all tending to show that the Emperor was *too* good-natured; and I shall have no difficulty in proving, when the time comes, that this excessive *laissez-faire* finally caused his ruin.

As yet, however, the cloud on the horizon is not bigger than a hand, and certainly not visible to the naked eye. And France is too busy enjoying herself to scan the sky with a spyglass. She does not even enact the fable of the hare with the telescope; she remains profoundly ignorant of the approach of her enemy. France resounds with laughter, and above it all rings that modern version of Rabelais' "*Fay ce que vouldras,*" viz., the chorus of Thérésa's song, "*Rien n'est sacré pour un sapeur,*" which chorus paints the moral atmosphere in one line.

For the sapper stood not alone in his irreverence for any and everything. He simply took his cue from those above him, from educated and talented men who deliberately mocked at "the whole world and his wife," including the sovereign and his consort, the former of whom they not only slighted in his private capacity, but as the chief of the State. Rochefort, at a later period, had at any rate the courage to attack openly; the par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tisans of the d' Orléans *régime* lacked that courage. They sailed as close to the wind as they dared without risking penalties. Strange to say, though, the worst blows to the Emperor's dignity came from the Emperor's friends and *protégés*, and were dealt in fun—"*histoire de s'amuser et d' amuser les autres.*" They came in the shape of practical jokes at which Society roared and the victim himself, who was rarely seen to smile, laughed outright.

On the face of it, the jokes perpetrated by "Napoleon III.'s double," as Eugène Vivier was called, may appear trivial. But the startling likeness of the famous cornet-player to the Emperor which made those jokes possible had its influence, nevertheless, on the Emperor personally, and gave rise to the most absurd stories during the heyday of the Empire, and above all at its fall; which stories only tended to diminish the Emperor's prestige.

"Paris is ringing again with another exploit of Vivier," says my note. "This time he has impersonated the Emperor at a supper at Mme. de Païva's and to such good purpose that several of her guests who frequently see and talk to his Majesty were completely taken in. It would appear that about a week ago the Emperor and the Empress were at the Italian opera, where Mme. de Païva's box faces that of their Majesties, and that the glare of the footlights hurt her Majesty's eyes. There was no screen in the Imperial box, and the Empress had only her fan to keep off the heat.* The Emperor remarked quite casually on the inconvenience to one of his aides-de-camp, saying, 'Mme. de Païva is better off than we are; look, what a beautiful Japanese screen she has!' The aide-de-camp in question happened to be on friendly terms with Mme. de Païva, and paid her a visit between the acts. Quite as casually as the Emperor he remarked upon the beauty of the screen, adding that the Emperor would be pleased to have a similar one for the Empress. Thereupon, Mme. de Païva unfastens the screen in question, hands it to her visitor, and bids him offer it to the Emperor with her respectful compliments for the use of the Empress. The aide-de-camp, though considerably embarrassed, dare not refuse the offer, and makes his way to the Imperial box with the screen, which he quietly adjusts in front of the Empress, who, however, sweeps it contemptuously out of her way. The Empress has not got her temper under sufficient control, and often allows it to get the better of her in public; under

* Fans were very small in those days; the large ones date from much later.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such circumstances the Emperor invariably pours oil upon the troubled waters, and he did so in this instance. He picked up the screen, and with a smile placed it in front of himself; and inasmuch as Mme. de Païva had narrowly watched the scene from the other side of the house, he considered himself bound to go and thank her personally the next day or the day after. For that part of the story I will, however, not vouch. I am under the impression that it is a pure fabrication, whether of Mme. de Païva herself or of some of her familiars I am unable to say. Both are equally inventive, and the rumor was evidently set afloat in order to find a basis for the next scene in which Vivier was to play his part. For even if one admits that the Emperor paid the alleged visit, his Majesty would certainly not have followed it up by inviting himself or accepting an invitation to a supper at Mme. de Païva's—at any rate not to a supper in company with a half-score of guests, not one of whom is particularly famed for the art of holding his tongue.

"Be this is as it may, the supper with the carefully 'prepared' entrance of Vivier, took place and has furnished fresh gossip for at least a week. Practically, the Emperor is powerless to prevent those things; he can neither send Vivier into exile nor condemn him to wear a mask, but there was no necessity to invite Vivier to the Tuileries and to have the performance repeated for the delectation of all and sundry, as the Emperor has done.

"The fact is, Vivier is *persona grata* with Louis Napoleon for a far different reason than people suspect. To begin with, Vivier is a Corsican; secondly, many years ago Vivier gave unsolicited testimony to Louis Napoleon's legitimacy, which has been so often called in question, and on which the Emperor is so exceedingly sensitive. It happened in 1844, while Vivier was giving some performances in London. One day he met a countryman of his with the name of Ceccaldi, who told him that Prince Louis was in London, and that he (Vivier) ought to pay his respects to him. 'Come to the French Theatre to-night and I will present you,' said Ceccaldi. At that time Vivier had never set eyes on the Prince, but the moment he entered the theatre he pointed him out to his companion. 'How do you know?' asked Ceccaldi; 'you have never seen him before.' 'No,' was the reply, 'but I recognized him at once by the like-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness to his father, to whom I was presented at Pisa.' Then there is the truly startling likeness between the Emperor and Vivier himself. Although it has already led to much mischief, *and may lead to further mischief*,* the Emperor, with his 'big heart,' his somewhat too active imagination, and his fatalism, is almost convinced that Vivier's existence is more or less bound up with his own.

"Thus we have the Jester in Ordinary to the Court, *i. e.*, Count Tascher; the Jester who performs 'by command,' namely, Eugène Vivier; and we have also the *corps de ballet* and the *corps dramatique*, for now and again there are choregraphic and other entertainments, generally arranged by the Princesse von Metternich, who enjoys herself at the Tuileries as she probably would not be allowed to enjoy herself at the Hofburg. The daughter of the famous Count Szandor, who by the by was as mad as a March hare (I mean the father), does not think it necessary to observe the same strict rules of etiquette towards the grandson of a Corsican lawyer and his wife, she would be bound to observe towards a Hapsburg and his spouse, herself a Princesse des Deux-Ponts-Birkenfeld. And to make the resemblance to the ordinary theatre complete, the noble and aristocratic ballerinas quarrel among themselves just like *rats de l'opéra*, issued from *concierges* and cabmen, and would come to blows now and then, like the humbler-born dancers, but for the timely intervention of the Empress."

"Is it a wonder, then, that the Païvas, the Skittles, the Cora Pearls, and the rest shrug their shoulders and smile, nay, laugh outright, at the mention of some of those *grandes dames de par le monde*. I doubt whether many of those *déclassées* be very witty; nevertheless, they are credited now and then with saying things which are worthy of a Ninon de l'Enclos and Rochefoucauld—although I strongly suspect that some of the clever literary men and journalists among their familiars are mainly responsible for the epigrammatic form of those remarks. This is perhaps another instance of 'Nemesis at work again,' for if in the beginning of the Empire the papers had been allowed a certain latitude

* I feel convinced that there was no prophetic intent to the words I have underlined in the above note. Nevertheless, after the fall of Sedan there were hundreds of people in France, and above all in Paris, who said that the Emperor was not at Wilhelmshohe at all, that Vivier had been sent for in hot haste and had taken his place. Absurd as was the story, it was encouraged by the Republicans, who saw in it a means of still further damaging the Emperor's prestige.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their comments upon matters political, the writers would not have been obliged to make themselves the assiduous chroniclers of the *faits et gestes* of that particular section of society in order to live. As it is, those records have become a permanent feature and will probably not disappear, however much the stringent rules with regard to political comment be relaxed in the future. At present there appears to be a tendency in the other direction, and the Emperor—who I feel persuaded is liberally inclined—does not know which course to adopt in consequence of the multiplicity of his counsellors, not two of whom appear to be agreed as to the degree of liberty to be granted, and all of whom—not to mince words—are making fools of themselves.

"Of course, the Cora Pearls, the Skittles, the Païvas, and the rest are only too delighted at all this, and confident of the support of their friends the journalists have entered into open rivalry with the Court beauties—again, of course, on the only ground where such rivalry was possible, namely, Longchamps, the Bois de Boulogne, the Champs-Elysées, and the theatres. Mdme. de Païva's boxes at the Opéra and at the Italiens are more luxuriously appointed than those of the Emperor and Empress; her diamonds are more costly than the latter's; Skittles's pony-chaise, with its pair of black cobs, and its two grooms on coal-black cattle behind, beats anything and everything from the Imperial stables; Cora Pearl's turn-out throws everything into the shade except Skittles's; the two latter cut a better figure on horseback than either the Comtesse de Pourtales, Mme. de Gallifet, Mme. de Contades, or Mme. de Persigny; they have only two equals in that respect—the Empress and Mme. de Metternich. Their carriage-horses, hacks and hunters look better, are better bred and broken in than the best elsewhere, and need not fear comparison with those provided by General Fleury for the use of her Majesty. As may be readily imagined, her Majesty is not particularly pleased. Fleury admits that there is cause for displeasure, but professes himself unable to alter the state of things."

By that time I was a young man of over twenty, and had paid several visits to London in the season, which enabled me to appreciate the difference—of course from a merely amateurish point of view—between the two capitals in the matter of horseflesh and conveyances. Well, the trained and severely critical eye of the real connoisseur would have unquestionably

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

awarded the palm for merit to the simple elegance in the Row and the Ladies' Mile; to the uninitiated the spectacle in the Avenue de l'Impératrice (at present the Avenue du Bois de Boulogne) would have appealed with greater effect. It was more showy; nevertheless, it was very beautiful, and the Parisians had, from what I was told, never seen anything like it.

The recollection in the shape of mental pictures has remained bright and vivid throughout these many, many years. I have no need to refer to notes to reconstruct the scenes; in fact, I have no notes bearing on that subject. I have simply to sit still and let the pictures uprise before me. The backgrounds are almost invariably the same; it is either the Arc de Triomphe standing like a grey pawn against a deep blue sky or the masses of dark green of the Bois apparently forming an impenetrable barrier at the end of the Avenue de l'Impératrice.

The first in the field is generally Mme. Feuillant with her two charming daughters, mere girls at that period. The whole of the turn-out is absolutely perfect, from an artistic point of view—I am not quite so sure about the other point—from the small heads of the two big black steppers, with large tufts of Parma violets at their headstalls, to the hood which appears to do duty as a storehouse for similar bouquets large and small. Violets predominate in the whole of the arrangement; they are conspicuous in the bonnet of Mme. Feuillant herself—a bonnet with a vallance, and which enframes the face like a portrait; the footman and coachman have hugh nosegays of violets, the tint of which harmonizes admirably with the collars and cuffs of their dark green liveries.

More conspicuous was the carriage of Mme. de Metternich. It was yellow, and yellow had almost entirely disappeared in those days, to be revived, however, later on. But in the early sixties only Mmes. de Gallifet, de Jancourt, and the Austrian Ambassadress patronized that colour.

Then came Rothschilds' turn-outs, always more remarkable for their magnificent horses than for the beauty of their carriages, and hard upon them the landau of Mdlle. Schneider, who as yet was not the Duchesse de Gérolstein, but simply La Belle Hélène.

Between half-past four and five there was generally a slight stir of expectation among the occupants of "la Plage," better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known to-day as "le Cercle des Décavés." In a little while there appeared on the horizon four troopers of some crack regiment of the Imperial Guards, flanked by a corporal, and immediately afterwards came the carriage of the little Prince Imperial followed by a captain's escort of the same regiment. To the left of the carriage rode the officer in charge, with a trumpeter by his side; to the right M. Bachon, the Prince's riding master and equerry, in a gold-embroidered green tunic, cocked hat with black feathers, white breeches, and jack-boots. About that period, however, M. Bachon's office was an absolute sinecure, the Prince having met with an accident which disabled him for many, many months from mounting his ponies, and the cause of which accident subsequently became also the cause of his premature and sad death in Zululand.*

Shortly afterwards came the Emperor in his phæton, without an escort of any kind, and only his aide-de-camp by his side. The pace of his Orloff's, which had cost 40,000 francs, was remarkable and somewhat dangerous to those who got in their way, for every now and then, and up to the last, the Imperial whip, forgetting that he was in France and not in England, mistook his nearside for his offside. Not once, but a dozen times, have I heard the indignant Jehu exclaim: "Where is he going to, the brute? Where did he learn to drive?" Though no man looked better on horseback than Napoleon III., he left off riding almost immediately after he ascended the throne, except on special occasions, such as reviews and at Compiègne while out hunting. Already at that time the Emperor had his horses broken in by M. Faverol de Kerbrech, just as he had his new boots worn by his barber. Then came the Empress in her elegant calèche drawn by four bays with postilions, outrider, and grooms, in green and gold, the first-named wearing jockeys' caps half hidden by the golden fringe of the tassels.

ALBERT D. VANDAM.

(To be Continued.)

APPENDIX TO PART VIII.

This is a note I made on the day the particulars of the Prince's death came to hand. The note was written entirely from memory, but I feel certain that all my facts are correct. "Several of the Prince's little playfellows had a foreign (English?) riding-master who knew nothing of the classical

* See Appendix to this Chapter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traditions of the French school, and who taught his pupils things which M. Bachon, the Prince's riding-master, was probably unable and certainly unwilling to teach his. M. Bachon had been second master to the celebrated M. d'Aure, in Paris, afterwards he had taught at Saumur. M. d'Aure, however, though a most brilliant horseman himself, had not founded a school of horsemanship. He was what I should call a brilliant equestrian improvisator rather than a sterling teacher. M. Bachon was an excellent riding-master, and that was all. He had none of the flashes of genius of his chief. He taught the Prince to ride perfectly broken-in ponies, and tacitly discountenanced all showy riding and tricks. And the showy riding and tricks were exactly what the little lad seemed to like most. Fired by the example of his playmates, who vaulted in the saddle while their tiny mounts were going at a galop, jumped down again, and repeated the feat over and again in spite of their frequent tumbles, the Prince tried to do the same, and one summer evening at Saint Cloud, while the Emperor was looking on, his son came heavily to the ground. He was up again in a moment, and there was no sign that he was badly or even slightly hurt. Had there been such a sign, the Emperor would have been too seriously alarmed to countenance for a single moment the continuation of the game, for assuredly no man ever loved his child better than Louis Napoleon loved his. The boy returned that affection a hundred fold, and it was this sweet trait in his character that caused him to hide his pain, for he fancied his father was annoyed with him for his inferiority to his play-fellows. Was his father annoyed, and did he show his annoyance? I cannot say. Certain it is that the little Prince went on vaulting; young as he was he would not be beaten.

"I know of a similar case of perseverance in his father's life. One severe winter while he was staying at Leamington there was a great deal of skating, and one of the favorite games was to jump over an upturned chair while going at a great pace. Prince Louis attempted the feat several times without success, coming down each time with a tremendous crash that made the lookers-on stare. He would not give in, though, and finally conquered the difficulty.

"To come back to the little Prince, who, after that night went on taking his riding lessons, but so languidly that M. Bachon began to reproach him with laziness. Instead of jumping into the saddle as he was wont to do, he had to be assisted, and in a little while bodily lifted on to his pony. M. Bachon, as yet ignorant of what happened, peremptorily bade him one day to place his foot into the stirrup, and then it all came out. Intensely frightened, the riding-master immediately communicated with the Emperor, who only remembered his son's fall in connection with his pluck. For months and months the child suffered and never mounted his ponies. He recovered gradually, but the habit he had contracted of hoisting himself into the saddle by means of his hands clung to him. Many of his friends in England could bear testimony to this. It was the cause of his death in Zululand. Trusting to his skill, he attempted to jump on to his horse which was already in motion; the holster, of which he caught hold for the purpose, gave way, and he was left to face the foe by himself. A. D. V.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GUESSES AT THE RIDDLE OF EXISTENCE.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D.

NEVER before has the intellect of man been brought so directly face to face with the mystery of existence as it is now. Some veil of religious tradition has always been interposed. At the beginning of this century most minds still rested in the Mosaic cosmogony and the Noachic deluge. Greek speculation was free, and its freedom makes it an object of extreme interest to us at the present time. But it was not intensely serious; it was rather the intellectual amusement of a summer day in Academe beneath the whispering plane.

No one who reads and thinks freely can doubt that the cosmogonical and historical foundations of traditional belief have been sapped by science and criticism. When the crust shall fall in appears to be a question of time, and the moment can hardly fail to be one of peril; not least in the United States, where education is general and opinion spreads rapidly over an even field, with no barriers to arrest its sweep..

Ominous symptoms already appear. Almost all the churches have trouble with heterodoxy and are trying clergymen for heresy. Quite as significant seems the growing tendency of the pulpit to concern itself less with religious dogma and more with the estate of man in his present world. It is needless to say what voices of unbelief outside the churches are heard and how high are the intellectual quarters from which they come. Christian ethics still in part retain their hold. So does the Church as a social centre and a reputed safeguard of social order. But faith in the dogmatic creed and the history is waxing faint. Ritualism itself seems to betray the need of a new stimulus and to be in some measure an æsthetic substitute for spiritual religion.

Dogmatic religion may be said to have received a fatal wound

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three centuries ago, when the Ptolemaic system was succeeded by the Copernican, and the real relation of the earth to the universe was disclosed. Dogmatic religion is geocentric. It assumes that our earth is the centre of the universe, the primary object of divine care, and the grand theatre of divine administration. The tendency was carried to the height of travesty when an insanely ultramontane party at Rome meditated, as, if we may believe Dr. Pusey, it did, the declaration of a hypostatic union of the Pope and the Holy Ghost. But it was in Byzantine or mediæval theosophy that the travesty had its source. The effect of the blow dealt by Copernicus was long suspended, but it is fully felt now that the kingdom of science is come, and the bearings of scientific discovery are generally known. When daylight gives place to starlight we are transported from the earth to the universe, and to the thoughts which the contemplation of the universe begets. "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" is the question that then rises in our minds. Is it possible that so much importance as the creeds imply can attach to this tiny planet and to the little drama of humanity? We might be half inclined to think that man has taken himself too seriously and that in the humorous part of our nature, overlooked by philosophy, is to be found the key to his mystery. The feeling is enhanced when we consider that we have no reason for believing that our senses are exhaustive, however much Science, with her telescopes, microscopes, and spectroscopes, may extend their range. We cannot tell that we are not like the sightless denizens of the Mammoth Cave, unconsciously living in the midst of wonders and glories beyond our ken.

Nor has the natural theology of the old school suffered from free criticism much less than revelation. Optimism of the orthodox kind seems no longer possible. Christianity itself, indeed, is not optimistic. It represents the earth as cursed for man's sake, ascribing the curse to primeval sin, and the prevalence of evil in the moral world as not only great but permanent, since those who enter the gate of eternal death are many, while those who enter the gate of eternal life are few. Natural theology of the optimistic school and popular religion have thus been at variance with each other. The old argument from design is now met with the answer that we have nothing with which to compare this world, and therefore, cannot tell whether it was possible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for it to be other than it is. Mingled with the signs of order, science discloses apparent signs of disorder, miscarriage, failure, wreck, and waste. Our satellite, so far as we can see, is either a miscarriage or a wreck. Natural selection by a struggle for existence, protracted through countless ages, with the painful extinction of the weaker members of the race, and even of whole races, is hardly the course which benevolence, such as we conceive it, combined with omnipotence, would be expected to take. If in the case of men suffering is discipline, though this can hardly be said when infants die or myriads are indiscriminately swept off by plague, in the case of animals, which are incapable of discipline and have no future life, it can be nothing but suffering; and it often amounts to torture. The evil passions of men, with all the miseries and horrors which they have produced, are a part of human nature, which itself is a part of creation. Through the better parts of human nature and what there is of order, beneficence, majesty, tenderness, and beauty in the universe, a spirit is felt appealing to ours, and a promise seems to be conveyed. But if omnipotence and benevolence are to meet, it must apparently be at a point at present beyond our ken. These are the perplexities which obtrude themselves on a scientific age.

What is man? Whence comes he? Whither goes he? In the hands of what power is he? What are the character and designs of that power? These are questions which, now directly presented to us, are of such overwhelming magnitude that we almost wonder at the zeal and heat which other questions, such as party politics, continue to excite. The interest felt in them, however, is daily deepening, and an attentive audience is assured to anyone who comes forward with a solution, however crude, of the mystery of existence. Attentive audiences have gathered round Mr. Kidd, Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Balfour, each of whom has a theory to propound. Mr. Kidd's work has had special vogue, and the compliments which its author pays to Professor Weismann have been reciprocated by that luminary of science.

Mr. Drummond undertakes to reconcile, and more than reconcile, our natural theology and our moral instincts to the law of evolution. His title, *The Ascent of Man*, is not new; probably it has been used by more than one writer before; nor is he the first to point out that the humble origin of the human species, instead of dejecting, ought to encourage us, since the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being who has risen from an ape to Socrates and Newton may hope to rise still higher in the future, if not by further physical development, which physiology seems to bar by pronouncing the brain unsusceptible of further organic improvement, yet by intellectual and moral effort. Mr. Drummond treats his subject with great brilliancy of style and adorns it with very interesting illustrations. Not less firmly than Voltaire's optimist persuaded himself that this was the best of all possible worlds, he has persuaded himself that evolution was the only right method of creation. He ultimately identifies it with love. The cruelties incidental to it he palliates with a complacency which sometimes provokes a smile. All of them seem to him comparatively of little account, inasmuch as the struggle for existence was to lead up to the struggle for the existence of others, in other words, to the production of maternity and paternity, with the altruism, as he terms it, or, as we have hitherto termed it, the affection, attendant on those relations. To reconcile us to the sufferings of the vanquished in the struggle he dilates on "the keenness of its energies, the splendor of its stimulus, its bracing effect on character, its wholesome lessons throughout the whole range of character." "Without the vigorous weeding of the imperfect," he says, "the progress of the world would not have been possible." Pleasant reading this for "the imperfect"!

> "If fit and unfit indiscriminately had been allowed to live and reproduce their kind, every improvement which any individual might acquire would be degraded to the common level in the course of a few generations. Progress can only start by one or two individuals shooting ahead of their species; and their life-gain can only be conserved by their being shut off from their species—or by their species being shut off from them. Unless shut off from their species their acquisition will either be neutralized in the course of time by the swamping effect of inter-breeding with the common herd, or so diluted as to involve no real advance. The only chance for evolution, then, is either to carry off these improved editions into 'physiological isolation,' or to remove the unimproved editions by wholesale death. The first of these two alternatives is only occasionally possible; the second always. Hence the death of the unevolved, or of the unadapted in reference to some new and higher relation with environment, is essential to the perpetuation of a useful variation."

This reasoning, with much more to the same effect, is plainly a limitation of omnipotence, and supposes that the ruling power of the universe could attain its end only at the expense of wholesale carnage and suffering; which cannot be glozed over, and which, as the weakness was not the fault of the weak, but of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maker, is in apparently irreconcilable conflict with our human notions of benevolence and justice.

This, however, is not all. We might, comparatively speaking, be reconciled to Mr. Drummond's plan of creation if all the carnage and suffering could be shown to be necessary or even conducive to the great end of giving birth to humanity and love. But Mr. Drummond himself has to admit that natural selection by no means invariably works in the direction of progress; that in the case of parasites it has consummated almost utter degradation. The phenomena of parasites and entozoa, with the needless torments which they inflict, appear irreconcilable with any optimistic theory of the direction of suffering and destruction to a paramount and compensating end. Not only so, but all the extinct races except those which are in the line leading up to man and may be numbered among his progenitors, must, apparently, upon Mr. Drummond's hypothesis, have suffered and perished in vain. That "a price, a price in pain, and assuredly sometimes a very terrible price," has been paid for the evolution of the world, after all is said, Mr. Drummond admits to be certain. But he holds it indisputable that even at the highest estimate the thing bought with that price was none too dear, inasmuch as it was nothing less than the present progress of the world. So he thinks we "may safely leave Nature to look after her own ethic." Probably we might if all the pain was part of the price. But we are distinctly told that it was not; so that there is much of it in which, with our present lights or any that Mr. Drummond is able to afford us, men can hardly help thinking that they see the ruthless operation of blind chance. Nature, being a mere abstraction, has no ethic to look after; nor has Evolution, which is not a power, but a method, though it is personified, we might almost say deified, by its exponent. But if there is not some higher authority which looks after ethic, what becomes of the ethic of man? The most inhuman of vivisectors, if he could show that his practice really led, or was at all likely to lead, to knowledge, would have a better plea than, in the case of suffering and destruction which have led to nothing, the philosophy of evolution can by itself put in for the Author of our being.

Mr. Drummond's treatise, like those of other evolutionists, at least of the optimistic school, assumes the paramount value of the type, and the rightfulness of sacrificing individuals without limit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to its perfection and preservation. But this assumption surely requires to be made good, both to our intellects and to our hearts. The ultimate perfection and preservation of the type cannot, so far as we see, indemnify the individuals who have perished miserably in the preliminary stages. Besides, what is the probable destiny of the type itself? Science appears to tell us pretty confidently that the days of our planet, however many they may be, are numbered, and that it is doomed at last to fall back into primeval chaos, with all the types which it may contain. Far from having an individual interest in the evolution of the type, the sufferers of the ages before Darwin had not even the clear idea of a type for their consolation. Evolutionists, in their enthusiasm for the species, are apt to bestow little thought on the sentient members of which it consists. "Man" is a mere generalization. This they forget, and speak as if all men personally shared the crown of the final heirs of human civilization. The following passage is an instance :—

"Science is charged, be it once more recalled, with numbering Man among the beasts, and levelling his body with the dust. But he who reads for himself the history of creation as it is written by the hand of Evolution will be overwhelmed by the glory and honor heaped upon this creature. To be a Man, and to have no conceivable successor; to be the fruit and crown of the long-past eternity, and the highest possible fruit and crown; to be the last victor among the decimated phalanxes of earlier existences, and to be nevermore defeated; to be the best that Nature in her strength and opulence can produce; to be the first of the new order of beings who, by their dominion over the lower world and their equipment for a higher, reveal that they are made in the Image of God—to be this is to be elevated to a rank in Nature more exalted than any philosophy or any poetry or any theology has ever given to man. Man was always told that his place was high; the reason for it he never knew till now; he never knew that his title deeds were the very laws of Nature, that he alone was the Alpha and Omega of Creation, the beginning and the end of Matter, the final goal of Life."

To be the last victor among the decimated phalanxes of earliest existences, and to be nevermore defeated, is, to say the least, a different sort of satisfaction from the glorious triumph of love in which the process of Evolution, according to Mr. Drummond, ends, and in virtue of which he proclaims that Evolution is nothing but the Involution of love, the revelation of Infinite Spirit, the Eternal Life returning to itself. It even reminds us a little of the unamiable belief that in the next world the sight of the wicked in torment will be a part of the enjoyment of the righteous. Perhaps there is also a touch of lingering geocentri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cism in this rapturous exaltation of Man. Evolution can give us no assurance that there are not in other planets creatures no less superior to man than he is to the lower tribes upon this earth.

The crown of evolution in Mr. Drummond's system is the evolution of a mother, accompanied by that of a father, which, however, appears to be inferior in degree. The chapters on this subject are more than philosophy; they are poetry, soaring almost into rhapsody. "The goal," Mr. Drummond says, "of the whole plant and animal kingdoms seems to have been the creation of a family which the very naturalist has to call mammals." The following passage is the climax:

"But by far the most vital point remains. For we have next to observe how this bears directly on the theme we set out to explore—the Evolution of Love. The passage from mere Otherism, in the physiological sense, to Altruism, in the moral sense, occurs in connection with the due performance of her natural task by her to whom the Struggle for the Life of Others is assigned. That task, translated into one great word, is Maternity—which is nothing but the Struggle for the Life of Others transfigured to the moral sphere. Focused in a single human being, this function, as we rise in history, slowly begins to be accompanied by those heaven-born psychical states which transform the femaleness of the older order into the Motherhood of the new. When one follows Maternity out of the depths of lower Nature, and beholds it ripening in quality as it reaches the human sphere, its character, and the character of the processes by which it is evolved, appear in their full divinity. For of what is maternity the mother? Of children? No; for these are the mere vehicle of its spiritual manifestation. Of affection between female and male? No; for that, contrary to accepted beliefs, has little to do in the first instance with sex-relations. Of what then? Of Love itself, of Love as Love, of Love as Life, of Love as Humanity, of Love as the pure and undefiled fountain of all that is eternal in the world. In the long stillness which follows the crisis of Maternity, witnessed only by the new and helpless life which is at once the last expression of the older function and the unconscious vehicle of the new, Humanity is born."

The father seems to be here shut out from the apotheosis; though why, except from a sort of philosophic gallantry, it is difficult to discern. The man who toils from morning till night to support wife and child surely has not less to do with it than the woman who feeds the child from her breast.

Somewhat paradoxical as it may seem, Mr. Drummond maintains that love did not come from lovers. It was not they that bestowed this gift upon the world. It was the first child, "till whose appearance man's affection was non-existent, woman's was frozen; and man did not love the woman, and woman did not love the man." Apparently, then, in a childless couple there can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be no love. Here, according to Mr. Drummond, is the birth of Altruism, for which all creation has travailed from the beginning of time. This appears to him a satisfactory solution of the problem of existence. Yet the races which have been sacrificed to the production of altruism, if they were critical and could find a voice, might ask if there was anything totally unselfish in the indulgence of the sexual passion, which after all plays its part in the matter, and of which the birth of a child is the unavoidable, not perhaps always the welcome, consequence. To the mother the child is necessary for a time in order to relieve her of a physical secretion; while it repays her care by its endearments, the enjoyment of which is altruistic only on the irrational hypothesis that affection and domesticity are not parts of self. To both parents, in the primitive state at all events, children are necessary as the support and protection of old age. Beautiful and touching parental affection is; pure altruism it is not. Very admirable, as a part of man's estate, it is; but we can hardly accept its appearance as a sufficient justification of all that has been suffered in the process of evolution or as a solution of the mystery of existence. It is curious that Mr. Drummond should place the happiest scene of female development and all that depends on it in the country where divorces are most common and the increase of their number is most rapid. He may have noted, too, that in that same country and among higher civilized races families are proportionately small and fewer women become mothers.

Then put the mammalia as high as we will in the scale of being, they are mortal. Evolution tells us complacently that death is necessary to the progress of the species. It may be so; but what is that to the individual? The more intense and exalted affection, whether conjugal or parental, is, the more heart-rending is the thought of the parting which any day and any one of a thousand accidents may bring, while it is sure to come after a few years. Pleasure and happiness are different things. Pleasure may be enjoyed for the moment without any thought of the future. The condemned criminal may enjoy it, and, it seems, does not uncommonly enjoy it in eating his last meal. But happiness appears to be hardly possible without a sense of security, much less with annihilation always in sight. The oracle to which we are listening has told us nothing about a life beyond the present. It is needless to say how much the character of that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question has been altered since the corporeal origin and relations of our mental faculties, and of what theology calls the soul, have been apparently disclosed by science. The thought of conscious existence without end is one which makes the mind, as it were, ache, and under which imagination reels; yet the thought of annihilation is not welcome, nor has it, up to this time, been distinctly faced by man. If ever it should be distinctly faced, its influence on life and action can hardly fail to be felt. Is the evolutionary optimist himself content to believe that nothing will survive the wreck, inevitable, if science is to be trusted, of this world?

To say that a particular solution of a difficulty is incomplete is not to say that the difficulty is insoluble or even to pronounce the particular solution worthless. Mr. Drummond's solution may be incomplete, and yet it may have value. The only moral excellence of which we have any experience or can form a distinct idea, is that produced by moral effort. If we try to form an idea of moral excellence unproduced by effort, the only result is seraphic insipidity. This may seem to afford a glimpse of possible reconciliation between evolution and our moral instincts. If upward struggle towards perfection, rather than perfection created by fiat, is the law of the universe, we may see in it, at all events, something analogous to the law of our moral nature.

Mr. Kidd's work was criticised in detail in the last number of this REVIEW by the vigorous pen of Mr. Roosevelt. His theory is that man owes his progress to his having acted against his reason in obedience to a supernatural and extra-rational sanction of action which is identified with religion. The interest of the individual and that of society, Mr. Kidd holds to be radically opposed to each other. Reason bids the individual prefer his own interest. The supernatural and extra-rational sanction bids him prefer the interest of society, which is assumed to be paramount, and thus civilization advances. The practical conclusion is that the churches are the greatest instruments of human progress.

What does Mr. Kidd mean by reason? He appears to regard it as a special organ or faculty, capable of being contradicted by another faculty, as one sense sometimes for a moment contradicts another sense, or as our senses are corrected by our intelligence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the case of the apparent motion of the sun. But our reason is the sum of all the faculties and powers which lead us to conviction or guide us in action. To be misled by it when weak or perverted is very possible; to act consciously against it is not. Simeon Stylites obeys it as well as Sardanapalus or Jay Gould. He believes, however absurdly, that the Deity accepts the sacrifice of self-torture, and that it will be well for the self-torturer in the sum of things. His self-torture is therefore in accordance with his reason. A supernatural sanction, supposing its reality to be proved, becomes a part of the *data* on which reason acts, or rather it becomes, for the occasion, the sole *datum;* and to obey it, instead of being unreasonable, is the most reasonable thing in the world. Misled by his reason, we repeat, to any extent a man may be, both in matters speculative and practical; but he can no more think or act outside of his reason, that is, the entirety of his impressions and inducements, than he can jump out of his skin. What Mr. Kidd seems at bottom to mean is that we may and do, with the best results, prefer social to individual, and moral to material, objects. But this is a totally different thing from acting against reason, and while it requires a certain elevation of character, it requires no extra-rational motive.

Mr. Kidd speaks of "reason" and the capacity for acting with his fellows in society as "two new forces which made their advent with man." He cannot mean, what his words might be taken to imply, that the rudiments of reason are not discernible in brutes, or that sociability does not prevail in the herd, the swarm, and the hive. To the herd, the swarm, and the hive sacrifices of the individual animal or insect are made like those of the individual man to his community. Is there supernatural or extra-rational sanction in the case of the deer, the ant, or the bee?

Altruism, acting against reason with a supernatural and extra-rational sanction, is, according to Mr. Kidd, the motive power of progress. But this altruism of which we hear so much, what is it? Man is not only a self-regardant, but a sympathetic, domestic, and social being. He is so by nature, just as he is a biped or a mammal. How he became so the physiologist and psychologist must be left to explain. But a sympathetic, domestic, and social being he is, and in gratifying his sympathetic, domestic, or social propensities, he is no more altruistic, if altruism means disregard of self, than he is when he gratifies his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire of food or motion. Self is not disregarded because self is sympathetic, domestic, and social. The man of feeling identifies himself with his kind; the father with his children; the patriot with his state; and they all look in various forms for a return of their affection or devotion. The man in each of the cases goes out of his narrower self, but he does not go out of self. Show us the altruist who gives up his dinner to benefit the inhabitants of the planet Mars and we will admit the existence of altruism in the sense in which the term seems to be used by Mr. Kidd and some other philosophers of to-day.

Reason, as defined by Mr. Kidd, appears to be a faculty which tells us what is desirable, but does not tell us what is possible "The lower classes of our population," he says, "have no sanction from reason for maintaining existing conditions." "They should in self-interest put an immediate end to existing social conditions." Why, so they would if they had the power, supposing their condition and the causes of it to be what Mr. Kidd represents. It is not altruism that prevents them but necessity; the same necessity which constrains people of all classes to submit to evils of various kinds, submission to which, if unnecessary, would be idiotic. That poverty and calamity have been endured more patiently in the hope of a compensation hereafter is true. but makes no difference as to the reasonableness of the endurance. From a comparison of the two sentences just quoted, it would appear that Mr. Kidd identifies reason with self-interest, and, therefore, with something antagonistic to society. Whereas, in a sociable being conformity to the laws of society is reason. "The interests of the social organism and of the individual," says Mr. Kidd, "are and must remain antagonistic." Why so in the case of a man any more than in that of a bee?

What is the "supernatural and extra-rational sanction" in virtue of which man acts against the dictates of his reason, and by so acting makes progress? Religion. What is religion?

> "A religion is a form of belief providing an ultra-rational sanction for that large class of conduct in the individual where his interests and the interests of the social organism are antagonistic, and by which the former are rendered subordinate to the latter in the general interests of the evolution which the race is undergoing."

Here is a definition of religion without mention of God. The supernatural sanction is religion, and religion is a supernatural

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sanction. This surely does not give us much new light. But we are further told that "there can never be such a thing as a rational religion." Superstition, such as the worship of Moloch, that of Apis, that of the gods of Mexico, or mediæval religion in its debased form, is not rational, nor will our calling it supernatural or extra-rational make it an influence above nature and reason, or prove it to have been the motive power of progress, which, on the contrary, it has retarded and sometimes, as in the case of Egypt, killed outright. The religions which in their day have been instruments of progress, and among which may perhaps be numbered, at a grade lower than Christianity, Mohammedanism and Buddhism, have owed their character to their rational adaptation to human nature and their consecration of rational effort. They are counterparts, not of the polytheistic state religion of Greece, but of the Socratic philosophy, which had a divinity of its own, the impersonation of its morality, and paid homage to the state polytheism only by sacrificing a cock to Æsculapius. Christianity, as it came from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth, was, like the philosophy of Socrates, unliturgical and unsacerdotal: its liturgy was one simple prayer. "Supernatural" is a convenient word, but it by implication begs the question, and when applied to superstitions is most fallacious. "Infranatural," or something implying degradation and grossness, not elevation above the world of sense, would be the right expression. Christian ethics, as distinguished from dogma, are not supernatural; they are drawn from, and adapted to, human nature. It is disappointing to find that a theorist who makes everything depend on the influence of religion should not have attempted to ascertain precisely what religion is and what is its origin, or to distinguish from each other the widely diverse phenomena which bear the name. His sanction itself calls for a sanction and calls in vain.

When a hypothesis will not bear inspection in itself, time is wasted in applying it, or testing its applications, to history. But Mr. Kidd says of the first fourteen centuries after Christ:

"So far, fourteen centuries of the history of our civilization had been devoted to the growth and development of a stupendous system of other-worldliness. The conflict against reason had been successful to a degree never before equalled in the history of the world. The super-rational sanction of conduct had attained a strength and universality unknown in the Roman and Greek civilizations. The State was a divine institution. The ruler held his place by divine right, and every political office and all subsidiary power issued from him in virtue of the same authority. Every consideration of the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was overshadowed in men's minds by conceptions of a future life, and the whole social and political system and the individual lives of men had become profoundly tinged with the prevailing ideas."

Of all the actions by which mediæval civilization was moulded and advanced, what percentage does Mr. Kidd suppose to have been performed under religious influence or from a spiritual motive? How many feudal kings and lords—how many, even, of the ecclesiastical statesmen of the Middle Ages does he suppose to have been carrying on a conflict with reason for objects other than worldly and under the inspiration of divine right? How much resemblance to the character of the Founder of Christianity would he have found among the rulers and the active spirits of the community or even of the Church? How much among the occupants of the Papal throne itself?

It has already been pointed out that Mr. Kidd, to say the least, overstates his case in saying that Christianity was directly opposed by all the intellectual forces of the time. So close was the affinity of Roman Stoicism to it that one eminent French writer has undertaken to demonstrate the influence of Christianity on the writings of the Roman Stoics. But it had also an ally in the melancholy of a falling empire and a perishing civilization. It had intellectual champions as soon as it had intellectual assailants, and their arguments were addressed to reason. The pessimistic melancholy of a falling empire and the revolt from a decrepit polytheism were also intellectual or partly intellectual forces on its side.

In the recent concessions of political power by the upper classes to the masses, Mr. Kidd finds an example of altruism prevailing over reason. That something has in the course of this revolution occasionally prevailed over reason might be very plausibly maintained. Whether it was anything supernatural or extra-rational seems very doubtful. In Great Britain, for instance, the extension of the franchise in 1832 was the result of a conflict between classes and parties carried on in a spirit as far as possible from altruistic and pushed to the very verge of civil war. Afterwards, the Whig leader finding himself politically becalmed, brought in a new Reform Bill to raise the wind, and was outbid by Derby and Disraeli, whose avowed object was to "dish the Whigs." Of altruistic self-sacrifice it would be difficult in the whole process to find much trace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If this branch of the inquiry were to be pursued, it might be worth while for Mr. Kidd to consider the case of Japan, the progress of which of late has been so marvellously rapid. It appears that in Japan, while the lower classes have a superstition at once very gross and very feeble, the upper classes, by whom the movement has been initiated and carried forward, have no genuine religion, but at most official forms, such as could not sustain action against self-interest.

The cause of human progress has been the desire of man to improve his condition, ever ascending as, with the success of his efforts, fresh possibilities of improvement were brought within his view. It is in this respect that he differs from the brutes. Mechanical evolution and selection by struggle for existence apply to man only in his rudimentary state or in his character as an animal. Of humanity, desire of improvement is the motive power. There is no need, therefore, of importing the language, fast becoming a jargon, of evolution into our general treatment of history. Bees, ants, and beavers are marvels of nature in their way. But they show no desire for improvement, and make no effort to improve. Man alone aspires. The aspiration is weak in the lower races of men, strong in the higher. Of its existence and of the different degrees in which it exists, science may be able to give an account. But it certainly is not the offspring of unreason, nor can it be aided in any way by superstition or by any rejection of truth.

A work on the foundations of religious belief by the leader of a party in the British House of Commons, who is by some marked out as a future Prime Minister, shows, like the theological and cosmogonical essays of Mr. Gladstone, the increasing interest felt about the problems, not only by divines and philosophers, but by men of the world. In Mr. Balfour's case the union of speculation with politics is the more striking, inasmuch as his work is one of abstruse philosophy. It is by metaphysical arguments that he undertakes to overthrow systems opposed to religion, and to rebuild the dilapidated edifice on new and surer foundations. He is thus treading in the steps of Coleridge, the great religious philosopher of the English Church. It is to a limited circle of readers that he appeals. Ordinary minds find metaphysics "out of their welkin," to use the words of the Clown in *Twelfth Night*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They venerate from afar a study which has engaged and still engages the attention of powerful intellects. But they are themselves lost in the region in which "transcendental solipsism" has its home. They are unable to see at what definitive conclusions, still more, at what practical conclusions, such as might influence conduct, philosophy has arrived. Metaphysic seems to them to be in a perpetual state of flux. "The theories of the great metaphysicians of the past," Mr. Balfour says, "are no concern of ours." They would surely concern us, however, if, like successive schools of science, they had made some real discoveries and left something substantial behind them. But as Mr. Balfour plaintively tells us, the system of Plato, notwithstanding the beauty of its literary vesture, has no effectual vitality; our debts to Aristotle, though immense, "do not include a tenable theory of the universe"; in the Stoic metaphysics "nobody takes any interest"; the Neo-Platonists were mystics, and in mysticism Mr. Balfour recognizes an undying element of human thought, but "nobody is concerned about their hierarchy of beings connecting through infinite gradations the Absolute at one end of the scale with matter at the other"; the metaphysics of Descartes "are not more living than his physics"; neither "his two substances, nor the single substance of Spinoza, nor the innumerable substances of Leibnitz satisfy the searcher after truth." Had these several systems been investigations of matters in which real discovery was possible, each of them surely would have discovered something, and a certain interest in each of them would remain. But they have flitted like a series of dreams, or a succession of kaleidoscopic variations. Mr. Balfour doubts "whether any metaphysical philosopher before Kant can be said to have made contributions to this subject (a theory of nature) which at the present day need to be taken into serious account," and he presently proceeds to indicate that "Kant's doctrines, even as modified by his successors, do not provide a sound basis for an epistemology of nature." Mr. Balfour seems even to think that philosophy is in some degree a matter of national temperament. He says that the philosophy of Kant and other German philosophers will never be thoroughly received so as to form standards of reference in any English-speaking community "until the ideas of these speculative giants are thoroughly re-thought by Englishmen and reproduced in a shape which ordinary Englishmen will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consent to assimilate." "Under ordinary conditions," he says, "philosophy cannot, like science, become international." This seems as much as saying that philosophy is still not a department of science, or a real investigation resulting in truths evident to all the world alike, but a mode of looking at things which may vary with national peculiarities of mind and character.

Locke, as Mr. Balfour reminds us, toward the end of his great work assures his readers that he "suspects that natural philosophy is not capable of being made science," and serenely draws from his admissions the moral that "as we are so little fitted to frame theories about this present world we had better devote our energies to preparing for the next." Perhaps we might amend the suggestion by saying that most of us had better devote our energies to the search for attainable truth and to the improvement of our character and estate in this world as a preparation for the world to come. A man so metaphysical in his cast as Emerson is obliged to say that we know nothing of nature or of ourselves, and that man has not "taken one step towards the solution of the problem of his destiny."

Before the relation of mind and body had been proved, and while the mind was supposed to have a divine origin of its own and to be a sojourner in the body as a temporary home or prison-house, it was perhaps easier to believe, as did the mediæval philosophers, that in the mind there was a source of knowledge about the universe apart from the perceptions of sense, and that the world might be studied, not by observation, but by introspection, and even through the analysis of language as the embodiment of ideas. Transcendental Solipsism and a world constructed out of categories would, under those conditions, have their day. Something of the mediæval disposition seems to lurk in the effort to demonstrate that the material world has no existence apart from our perceptions. Be this true or not, it can make little difference in our theological or spiritual position. The fact must be the same in the case of a dog as in the case of a man.

Most of us, therefore, will be content to look on while Mr. Balfour's metaphysical blade, flashing to the right and left, disposes of "Naturalism" on the one hand and of Transendentalism on the other. We have only to put in a gentle *caveat* against any idea of driving the world back through general scepticism to faith. Scepticism, not only general, but universal, is more likely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be the ultimate result, and any faith which is not spontaneous, whether it be begotten of ecclesiastical pressure or intellectual despair, is, and in the end will show itself to be, merely veiled unbelief. The catastrophe of Dean Mansel, who, while he was trying in the interest of orthodoxy, to cut the ground from under the feet of the Rationalist, himself inadvertently demonstrated the impossibility of believing in God, was an awful warning to the polemical tactician.

Mr. Balfour gets on more practical ground and comes more within the range of general interest when he proceeds to set up authority apart from reason as a foundation of theological belief. Above reason authority must apparently be if it is apart from it, for wherever authority has established itself reason must give way, while it has no means of constraining the submission of authority. No one could be less inclined to presumptuous rationalism than Butler, who, in his work, which though in partial ruin is still great, with noble frankness accepts reason as our only guide to truth. In combating the objections against the evidences of Christianity, Butler says that "he expresses himself with caution lest he should be mistaken to vilify reason, which is indeed the only faculty we have to judge concerning anything, even revelation." What is deference to authority but the deference to superior knowledge or wisdom which reason pays, and which, if its grounds, intellectual or moral, fail or become doubtful, reason will withdraw? This is just as true with regard to the authority of tradition as with regard to that of a living informant or adviser; just as true with regard to the authority of a Church as with regard to that of an individual teacher or guide. Authority, Mr. Balfour says, as the term is used by him, "is in all cases contrasted with reason and stands for that group of non-rational causes, moral, social, and educational, which produces its results by psychic processes other than reason." A writer may affix to a term any sense he pleases for his personal convenience; but the reasoning of the psychic process of deference to authority, though undeveloped, and, perhaps, till it is challenged, unconscious, whether its cause be moral, social, or educative, is capable of being presented in a rational form, and cannot, therefore, be rightly called non-rational. There is, of course, a sort of authority, or what is so styled, which impresses itself by means other than rational, such as religious persecution, priestly thaumaturgy,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual terrorism, or social tyranny. But in this Mr. Balfour would not recognize a source of truth or foundation of theological belief. A philosopher who proposes to rebuild theology, wholly or in part, on the basis of authority, seems bound to provide us with some analysis of authority itself, and some test by which genuine authority may be distinguished from ancient and venerable imposture. Papal infallibility, which Mr. Balfour cites as an instance, does undoubtedly postulate the submission of reason to authority; but it proved the necessity of that submission by the extermination of the Albigenses and the holocausts of the Inquisition. It is still ready, as its Encyclical and Syllabus intimate, to sustain the demonstration by the help of the secular arm.

So in the case of habit. Our common actions have no doubt become by use automatic, as our common beliefs are accepted without investigation. But if they are challenged, reasons for them can be given. A man eats without thinking, but if he is called upon he can give a good reason for taking food. A soldier obeys the word of command mechanically, but if he were called upon he could give a good reason for his obedience.

Mr. Balfour scarcely lets us see distinctly what is his view of belief in miracles, which must play an important part in any reconstruction or review of the basis of theology, an all-important part, indeed, if Paley was right in saying, as he did in reply to Hume, that there was no way other than miracle in which God could be revealed. He seems inclined to represent the objections to them as philosophical rather than historical, and such as a sounder philosophy may dissipate, intimating that rationalists have approached the inquiry with a predetermination "to force the testimony of existing records into conformity with theories on the truth or falsity of which it is for philosophy not history to pronounce." This might be said with some justice of Strauss's first *Life of Jesus*, and perhaps of some other German philosophies of the Gospel history. But the current objections to miracles, with which a theologian has to deal, are clearly of a historical kind. A miracle is an argument addressed through the sense to the understanding, which pronounces that the thing done is supernatural and proof of the intervention of a higher power. It seems inconceivable, if the salvation of the world were to depend on belief in miracles, that Providence should have failed to provide records for the assurance of those who were not eye-witnesses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal in certainty to the evidence afforded eye-witnesses by sense. Are the records of the miracles which we possess unquestionably authentic and contemporaneous? Were the reporters beyond all suspicion, not only of deceit, but of innocent self-delusion? Were they, looking to the circumstances of their time and their education, likely to be duly critical in their examination of the case? Is there anything in the internal character of the miracles themselves, the demoniac miracles for example, to move suspicion, it being impossible to think that Providence would allow indispensable evidences of vital truth to be stamped with the marks of falsehood? What is the weight of the adverse evidence derived from the silence of external history and the apparent absence of the impression which might have been expected to be made by prodigies such as miraculous darkness and the rising of the dead out of their graves? These questions, daily pressed upon us by scepticism, are strictly historical, and will have to be treated by restorers of theological belief on strictly historical grounds.

Mr. Balfour recognizes mysticism as an "undying element in human thought." That it is not yet dead is evident. Minds not a few have taken refuge in various forms of it. But undying it surely is not. The mystic, however exalted, merely imposes on himself. He creates by a subtle sophistication of his own mind the cloudy object of his faith and worship. He had himself written his Book of Mormon, and hidden it where he found it. In that direction there can be no hope of laying the foundation of a new theological belief.

There can be no hope, apparently, of laying new foundations for a rational theology in any direction excepting that of the study of the universe and of humanity as manifestations of the supreme power in that spirit of thorough-going intellectual honesty of which Huxley, who has just been taken from us, is truly said to have been an illustrious example. That we are made and intended to pursue knowledge is as certain as that we are made and intended to strive for the improvement of our estate, and we cannot tell how far or to what revelations the pursuit may lead us. If revelation is lost to us manifestation remains, and great manifestations appear to be opening on our view. Agnosticism is right, if it is a counsel of honesty, but ought not to be heard if it is a counsel of despair.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

REVOLVER OR SABRE.

THE introduction of gunpowder created a revolution in the art of war which has developed for the military student some interesting and curious facts. Before then, physical strength and endurance were absolute requisites of an accomplished soldier. The great captains of those days, upon every available opportunity, practised their men in such athletic sports as would make them most proficient with the weapons they used. The Roman soldiers during the long period of their military supremacy had for their principal weapon a short heavy sword, with which they rushed into a hand to hand conflict with the enemy. Their athletic training and disciplined valor carried victory with them for hundreds of years and maintained their supremacy in arms, till luxury and dissipation rendered them an easy victim to their more hardy conquerors from the North. Ancient traditions are clung to most persistently in the selection of military weapons. In modern cavalry armament, we find the sabre and lance, a modification of the ancient sword and spear, adhered to with a pertinacity for which it is difficult to account on rational grounds. Let us fancy two soldiers in the mounted service, equally brave, one thoroughly trained to handle the sabre and the other an accomplished revolver shot. Station them one hundred yards apart and let them advance toward each other at any gait, with hostile intent. Can any one for an instant expect but one result—that the man with the sabre shall certainly be destroyed before he can arrive within striking distance of his enemy? Suppose we made the number a thousand; is there any ground to suppose the result would differ materially in illustrating the superiority of the revolver over the sabre? To exemplify this in another form; let us suppose, that a sabre cut over the head, or a thrust through the body, is equal to a wound from a revolver bullet: and for the sake of argument we will allow the man with the sabre, to arrive within ten feet of his enemy with the revolver; we will assume that ten seconds are required for a "sabreur" to successfully carve one man and get within striking distance, about three and a half or four feet, of another. We know that it is a very ordinary feat for a good revolver shot, mounted, to fire five shots in five seconds and hit a mark the size of a man, every time, at a distance of ten feet, and this with his horse at a full run. The reverence with which we cling to arms ancient might make a wise soldier laugh, were its effects not so pernicious, as sometimes, to make a good soldier weep. Our recent civil war developed some excellent cavalry officers on both sides, and in the opinion of many competent judges, General Custer was second to none. For some time previous to 1876 he commanded the Seventh Cavalry in various Indian campaigns. Being full of energy and ambition, it is reason-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to suppose he trained his troopers with all the judgment and skill derived from his extensive experience. The sabre was the recognized cavalry weapon, and at that time, our cavalry officers gave little or no attention to mounted fire. In 1876 we find a portion of this cavalry, under General Custer, numbering about three hundred of his best troops, engaged with hostile Sioux and Cheyennes.

These Indian warriors had been brought up on horseback and trained from boyhood to use firearms mounted. The battle took place upon an open and gently undulating country near the Little Horn River, and not a single white man was left to clear the mystery which shrouded the details of the engagement. About two years subsequent to this event, the writer became well acquainted with some of the Sioux and Cheyennes engaged in this fight against the Seventh Cavalry, and after much difficulty they were induced to describe the details of the action. Three of these Indians at different times gave their versions of the battle, and their accounts did not vary in material points. They said the Indians charged upon the cavalry, firing their rifles and pistols, and that the action lasted about half an hour. Thirty-five or forty Indians were killed, and they believed most of the casualities were due to the Indians shooting one another, as they attacked the cavalry on both flanks at the same time.

They said that the cavalry horses were so terrified by the yells, shooting and appearance of the warriors that the soldiers had all they could do to keep their seats, that many of them were thrown, and that they did little execution among the savages. It must be remembered that up to this time our cavalry had received little or no training with the revolver, and that the Indians outnumbered the cavalry, three or four to one. Had the latter known how to handle their revolvers, they would have sent many times their own number to the happy hunting ground.

Toward the close of our late unpleasantness the central part of Missouri was infested by a body of men claiming to belong to the Southern Army, under a leader named Bill Anderson. These men had for their sole armament from four to six revolvers each and were mounted upon the best horses the country afforded. For about a week they were camped in a pasture near the house where the writer, then a boy, lived, and we had a number of opportunities to observe their occupation. They spent several hours each day at mounted pistol practice, putting their horses at a full run and shooting at trees or fence posts. Some of them would, at times, vary this practice by taking the bridle reins in their teeth and firing a revolver from each hand. As we remember, their shooting was excellent. A few months later, a body of cavalry, variously estimated at from 200 to 250, were landed by the railroad at Centralia, Mo., to operate against Bill Anderson and his men. The country around this railroad station is an almost perfectly level prairie. This cavalry had proceeded but two or three miles from their landing place when they encountered the enemy. Anderson formed a skirmish line and charged, some of his men taking the bridle reins in their teeth and a revolver in each hand. The affair was soon ended. Of the 200 or 250 men only ten escaped with their lives; the others were laid out over the prairie for a distance of several miles. Anderson lost only five or six men.

So far as we can learn, little progress has been made by the cavalry of European armies in mounted revolver shooting, owing to the fact that they lack a knowledge of the art and that they have too much respect for ancient traditions. The military establishment of our country has reached a much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher state of efficiency in the use of firearms than that of any other nation.

This is due to the liberal appropriations of Congress for target practice, the knowledge and skill of our officers in revolver and rifle shooting, and the facility with which they impart this most valuable of all military accomplishments to the enlisted men.

For many centuries the theory and practice amongst civilized nations has been to train cavalry to act by the collective shock; that is, to develop no individuality, but to have them ride boot to boot, in a solid mass with drawn sabres and with an irresistible force, so as to overwhelm all in front of them. With the individuality now to be found in the foot soldier of an ordinary skirmish line, such a mass of cavalry would be destroyed, or rendered useless before they could arrive within two hundred yards of the objective point. The modern cavalry soldier should be trained to the highest degree of individual excellence in the management of his horse and revolver; he should be armed with a carbine and at least two revolvers, and have the useless, clanking and antiquated sabre consigned to some spot from which it could have no resurrection. The cavalryman should be practised with the revolver till he could fire five shots in four seconds, and be able to hit, two out of three times, an object the size of a man, at a distance of ten yards, with horse at a full run. To one not familiar with revolver shooting this may seem a difficult thing to do, and it may appear to require too high a standard of excellence from the average cavalry soldier, but it must be remembered that revolver shooting is like many other physical accomplishments: it is learned much more rapidly when the instruction is carried on according to some correct system. The exercises of the recruit, while he is learning to ride and handle his horse, should be varied by at least two hours' work each day, devoted to handling and snapping his revolver on foot, so that the correct execution of these exercises may become mechanical; in other words, the recruit should be trained to bring his pistol to bear upon an object and hit it without any perceptible time being spent in taking aim and pulling the trigger. Ours is an age of specialists, and it is seldom that one is found who can reach the highest degree of excellence in more than one mechanical art. When this skill is once attained in using a revolver, there is ever a good demand for its services, and the confidence and courage which its possession is certain to give to our cavalry soldier will make him brave and self-reliant to an extent which will render him on the field of battle more than a match for five times his number of the best cavalry the old world has ever seen.

W. P. HALL,
Major and Assistant Adjutant-General; late Captain Fifth United States Cavalry.

WHAT MEN THINK OF WOMEN'S DRESS.

IF we accept the oldest writings concerning the subject, we must concede that the first costume worn by primitive man and woman was selected only after a consultation of the two sexes. It is a curious fact that after centuries of groping in the blind labyrinths of dress, women are returning in some measure toward primitive ideas and conditions. They are just beginning to appreciate the aid of men in matters of this sort.

The increase of liberty that women enjoy in this latter decade or two, their entrance into the realm of men's occupations, and their consequent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire for greater freedom in dress, make it a hard matter, under these scarcely-adjusted conditions, to draw the line between masculine likes and dislikes as to dress reform. It may be stated emphatically, however, that almost all men abominate all forms of woman's attire that merely aim to be "mannish," that are adopted only for the sake of making a "smart" appearance. Mannish collars, vests, hats, neckties, etc., when worn by women, almost always create a revulsion of feeling in a man by impairing that femininity in appearance which must always be one of the greatest charms of womanhood.

At the same time men would gladly encourage women in their natural right to adopt such modifications as would give them greater freedom for exercise or business pursuits, and consequently greater health. There was great fear among the timid that the adoption of the modern bicycling costumes would subject the wearer to vulgar comment, or at least insufferable stares, from men. The fact is that women stare at and criticise their progressive sisters more than men do.

Men do not object in the least to their wives, or sisters, or daughters, wearing "gym" suits for athletics, divided skirts or Turkish trousers for bicycling, or even for business, so long as the touch of femininity, of modesty, is never lost in the making of such costumes. The man does not concern himself with details about such garments, but he looks for that roundness, as opposed to angularity; that grace, be it of a fluffy wing, or a ruffle, or gather; that little adornment, a touch of color, ribbon, flowing outline, that shall proclaim at once the sweetness and preciousness of womanhood.

Men naturally wish to pay, and do pay, the greatest deference to womanhood, even in the crowded business life of New York City, but they demand in return that women shall dress so as to suggest unmistakable womanliness.

As we are all striving to attain to Altrurian conditions we need to study the matter of dress from the very base and beginning. Science is now only content to go to the very bottom of things, and, discarding all custom and tradition, demands a reason for everything. So it should be with dress. Men and women are different. Therefore their dress should be different. But as their spheres of activity are becoming more and more closely allied, so their dress should permit equal freedom of movement and equal health. A beautiful statue, be it the cruelly amputated Venus of Milo, or the Medici, or the Greek Slave, almost all of us, except some singular back-country spinster, unite in saying needs no adornment. But it would be a good practice to take that statue and dress it, not according to the prevailing mode, but according to the demands of the figure, that, being itself beautiful, its beauty should not be lost, but in some degree preserved, if not enhanced by its dress. A company of art critics would dress it in the flowing robes of ancient Greece. At the same time a committee of doctors or disciples of physical culture might not grant it any more drapery than has the Diana of St. Gaudens on the Madison Square tower.

It should be a recognized principle that beauty of figure is not to be hidden or lost by means of dress. There is no need to distort the art of the Creator by the art of the milliner. If a woman has a beautiful throat, she has a perfect right to reveal it, except when she runs a risk of taking cold. Almost every woman has some good feature. Let her make the most of it. Be it beauty of eyes or hair, or complexion, beauty of stature, of strength, of arm or limb, dress should enhance it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The gain, for instance, that would accrue to the race in the way of increased health and happiness, and lessened pain and doctors' bills, if the average skirt was cut ten inches shorter, would be tremendous. By that one simple surgical stroke of the scissors, quick and painless, think how many hundreds of tons of mud-bedraggled dry-goods would drop from the overweighted hips of womanhood! But the very women who abbreviate the corsage of their opera-dresses to an equal extent would shrink at the display of a well-turned ankle. Yet the former practice is far more vulnerable to criticism than the one we would advocate. It must be kept in mind that a style of dress that encourages physical development is not designed alone for women of fine physique. Its popularity would lead all women to covet health and symmetry of form and to work for it by all the proper agencies of diet, exercise, sleep and sensible living generally. It has been an old grievance of our fathers and grandfathers that it took a fearfully sharper eye to select a good woman than a good horse. And when they so often got cheated on a horse, is it a wonder that millions of men have filled bachelors' graves? A bachelor's grave is a cold thing to look forward to, but many have thought that it was preferable to taking a chance in that lottery where the diamonds and the booby-prizes, the Venuses and the viragoes, have all been concealed in a maze of crinoline and whalebone, cotton, powder and paint. Who could know whether the beautiful maiden or the ugly dwarf would step forth on the night of disenchantment? We gladly testify that our *fin-de-siècle* daughters are dressing in some respects with greater good taste and fidelity to common sense, truth, health, the laws as well as the lines of their own physique, than did their grandmothers.

Of course there is a dress for children, a dress for the young, for the old, for the invalid. We kindly drape the angles and the weaknesses in the loved forms where age has set its wrinkled seal over the once virgin stamp of beauty. Yet old age, too, has its beauties, and its fitting adornment. It is among the ranks of the women themselves that there is the greatest objection to new ideas. Speaking for men, it may be said that they consider themselves fortunate in a dress that is fairly easy and healthful, if not pleasing from an artistic standpoint. In their good fortune they do not begrudge to women any modifications of their attire on which they can set the stamp of true femininity and add grace and artistic effect to what is merely practical. Whatever makes for greater health and comfort to women is not a matter of indifference to the stern sex, however they may seem to leave the women to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. There will be no more hearty plaudits to the successful solver of the dress reform problem than will come from the "men's gallery." Ahasuerus is still gracious, and Esther need never fear but that she will find favor in his sight in any sort of modest garb whatever.

On one detail of dress I think I can speak with confidence, and that is, it makes no difference in a man's eye what material a dress is made of. You can please him just as well in calico as in silk, and perhaps better, if he has to pay the bills. "It is all in the making," is a phrase that means much to men. They like symmetry, grace, harmony of colors, perfect fit. For one man that will be dazzled by purple and gold there are a dozen who will be charmed by quiet grays or browns, relieved by a bright ribbon and a bright face. "Back to nature" is the cry of this logical, matter-of-fact and yet impressionable age; and learning of nature, and of her garments of leaves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and grass and snow, we shall see how closely she clothes her forms, only softening the outlines, selects her quiet harmonies of colors rather than glaring contrasts, and covers nothing from sight that is of itself beautiful.

C. H. CRANDALL.

HISTORICAL NICKNAMES.

EDMOND ABOUT, in one of his last contributions to the *Revue de Deux Mondes*, suggested that the political history of several nations could be written in the form of a compendium of national epigrams and *vaudevilles* —a sort of facetious ditties in which the French are rivalled only by their Italian neighbors.

A collection of historical nicknames would, however, serve the same purpose in a still more compendious form. There are *sobriquets* that sum up all the physical and moral characteristics of an individual and sometimes of a party or even a whole nation. "What are the main tendencies of your 'Liberals' and 'Serviles,' as your Highness has begun to call them?" a German politician asked Prince de Ligne, the Austrian Chesterfield. "Well, you see, our Serviles want *sehr vieles* (a good many things), but our Liberals want *lieber alles*" (rather everything), said the keenwitted courtier.

When the braggard Bernadotte had got himself elected Crown Prince of Sweden, he did his best to propitiate public opinion all around, assumed the name of Charles Jean, loaded foreign diplomatists with decorations, and offered his services as mediator between France and the victorious allies, but his old companions in arms had sized him up to an inch and nicknamed him "Charles Jean Charlatan." Complacent King Joseph they called "*le roi par ordre*," and the depredations of General Vandamme were commemorated in the epithet "Jacques Brigand"—"Billy Bushwhacker," as we might translate it. For Napoleon himself his soldiers had only affectionate nicknames: "The Little Corporal," "Little Wideawake"; but Madame de Staël in a fit of resentment called him "Robespierre on horseback" (*Robespierre à cheval*), and the nickname stuck like the pun of that Ghent Alderman who bribed the retail butchers of his city (locally known as *les petits bouchers*) to get up a transparency with the inscription: "The little butchers of Ghent to Napoleon the Great."

The "Grand Butcher" was not apt to forgive a personal squib of that kind, but nevertheless almost choked with laughing when Count Las Cases at Longwood ventured to acquaint him with the popular nickname of his royal brother-in-law, Murat. The *parvenu* King of Naples was incorrigibly fond of dressing in theatrical finery, gold-lace jackets with broad lace collars and blue velvet surtouts, and in allusion to that foible the Parisian wits called him "King Franconi," Franconi's Opera being a flashy pleasure resort of the French capital. Louis XVIII. they called "Gros Revenue," to commemorate a high treasonable pun of a witty Imperialist, who had heard his comrades complain of the enormous taxes of the new regime. "Never mind, *payons, payons, nous avons un gros revenu*"—we have a large revenue—the three last words meaning also "a returned potbelly." After the battle of Waterloo they called their wellfed sovereign "Louis *deux fois neuf*," "twice nine," with the additional meaning of "twice new." Those puns had much to do with the final expulsion of the Bourbons, and it might be questioned if all the speeches of the Jacobins hurt the cause of the royal family as much as the Queen's nickname, "Madame Veto." That those same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jacobins were capable of self-banter is, however, proved by their sobriquet of the frivolous cut-throat Barère, "the Anacreon of the Guillotine."

With a similar humor the wits of the Napoleonic era called the flunkey naturalist Lacépède (a great authority on snakes), "The *chef* of the reptiles." "The Deity rested after the creation of Napoleon the Great," the eloquent professor concluded one of his characteristic speeches. "A pity that the Deity did not rest then a little sooner," said the Count de Narbonne. As a rule the Imperialists would not permit the humorists of any other nation to quiz their new made potentates, but they could not help endorsing the verdict of the tax-burdened Hessians who called their profligate king (Brother Jérôme) "Koenig Don Juan."

In the Crown Prince phase of his existence, Kaiser Wilhelm, the victor of Sadowa and Sedan, had made himself so unpopular that the Berliners called him the *Kartätschen Prinz* (the grape-and-canister Prince, and demolished his metropolitan palace. Voltaire, after his Prussian experiences, could not revenge himself in that manner, but contrived to saddle old Fritz with the sobriquet of "Luc"—originally the name of a mischievous and highly irascible baboon which a French traveller had presented to the Philosopher of Ferney. The brother of the Canister Prince had a constitutional horror of gunpowder, and worshipped Bacchus rather to the neglect of Mars, but was so affable to interviewers of all parties that he got off with the nickname of "Champagne Freddie" (Der Champagner Fritz). All in all, he was about the easiest-going King that ever contrived to maintain himself on a storm-tossed throne, and when the Burgomaster of a rather democratic Rhineland city presented him with a bumper of wine, "warranted as pure as our citizens' loyalty to your royal house," his majesty merely held the glass against the light and whispered: "Vintage of Forty-eight?"—the year of the Rhenish insurrection.

He knew his nickname, and connived at the public banter of his foibles with a philosophical tolerance entirely foreign to the character of one of his successors, whose subjects have never yet ventured to translate the London-made sobriquet of "Billy Bombastes." Marechal Blucher took part in a debate on the best way of translating Napoleon's favorite nickname of the bibulous leader of the Prussian cavalry, and finally voted that "*Der versoffene Husar*" (the drunken old Hussar) would come the nearest to a good fit.

"I know what they call me," said the Calabrian robber-chief, who had baffled Murat's rangers for eighteen months, "but I would much sooner be known as 'Fra Diavolo' (Friar Satan) than as Fra Sanducho—Brother hypocrite"; and it is probable that the remorseless representative of the Borgias would have rather prided himself on the title of "Cardinal Mephistopheles." The Venetians can compete with the wits of the French metropolis in the manufacture of telling nicknames, and a lady whom Napoleon in his consular days had pronounced the best-looking female of Southern Europe was ever after known as "La Bella par decreto—ma' sin il *verendo*"— the beauty by special cabinet order—but without the "verendo" ("Seeing," *i. e.*, "whereas," the initial phrase of an official decree); and when Maria Theresa ordered some nude Italian statues to be draped in nether garments, the sculptor revenged himself by calling her *la calzonera*—the "pantaloon maker." The good-natured empress laughed at the conceit as heartily as her great son at his sobriquet, *der Kloster Hetzer*—the "convent cleaner" (the cleaner-out of superfluous monasteries), and Marshal Vendôme used to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that he would forfeit all his titles sooner than his nickname, "General Bonhomme." With all his cynicisms, he was, indeed, *Bonhommie* personified, and once pardoned a petty marauder for the sake of his ready wit. "So they are going to hang you? Serves you right; only a scoundrel will risk his life for ten francs." "Ah, *mon general*, how often had I to risk my life for ten coppers," (the daily pay of a French soldier) said the delinquent, and was at once dismissed with a laugh and the admonition to "keep his neck greased for the next time." The slang-loving old campaigner had a vein of pathos, too, and in his last moment, when a friend tried to draw the stiff curtains of his Spanish chateau, to keep the moon from shining in the sick room, the dying veteran beckoned him to desist: "*Laissez-ça; je vois la grande ombre de l'Eternité qui s'avance*"—"Never mind; the shadow of eternity is going to save you that trouble in a minute or two."

The subjects of the late Czar called him in his Crown Prince days the "Young Steer," and afterwards simply "the Steer," and the Army of the Potomac is said to have very privately applied a similar sobriquet to a general who confessed that he "never manœuvred," and certainly preferred headlong charges to elaborate tactics. Some Berlin journalists who had seen him on his *tour de monde*, called him *der Nussknacker General*, in allusion to a silent automaton that is placed upon German banquet tables together with a plate of hazelnuts, but added that he had unquestionably contrived to crack some nuts that had broken the teeth of all other comers.

The soldiers of the first Napoleon embellished the accounts of their campaigns with a vocabulary of historic geographical nicknames: "Capuchin-Land" for Spain, "Knoutland," for the dominions of the Czar, "Mastiff land" for Great Britain, and "Big-wig land" *(terre des perruques)* for Prussia. But their exploits in that special field have been rather eclipsed by the achievements of American humor; witness the following list of *facetiæ* that was collected at a recent convention of commercial travellers:

British Columbia, "The Drizzle Land"; Maine, "The Foggy State"; Vermont, "The Clabber State"; Massachusetts, "The Schoolmar'm State"; New Jersey, "The Mosquito State"; Delaware, "The Cowhide State"; Pennsylvania, "The Blue Law State"; Ohio, "The Lobby State" (Kinsmen of Orpheus C. Kerr in force); Kentucky, "The Shotgun State"; Indian Territory, "The Horse-thief Reserve"; Kansas, "The Howler State"; Arkansas, "The Quinine State"; Mississippi, "The Ku-klux State"; Tennessee, "The Moonshine State"; South Carolina, "The Congo State" (preponderance of Ethiopian elements); North Carolina, "The Granny State"; California, "The Boodle State"; Texas, "The Rowdy State"; Colorado, "The Growler State"; the Dakatos, "Blizzard Land"; Indiana, "The White Cap State"; Mexico, "Bushwhacker Land."

F. L. OSWALD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED